

Gamma-ray bursts as probes of high-redshift Lyman- α emitters and radiative transfer models

J.-B. Vielfaure^{1,2}, S. D. Vergani², M. Gronke^{3*}, J. Japelj⁴, J. T. Palmerio², J. P. U. Fynbo^{5,6}, D. B. Malesani⁷,
B. Milvang-Jensen^{5,6}, R. Salvaterra⁸, N. R. Tanvir⁹

¹ Université de Paris, CNRS, AstroParticule et Cosmologie, F-75013, Paris

² GEPI, Observatoire de Paris, PSL University, CNRS, 5 Place Jules Janssen, 92190 Meudon, France

³ Department of Physics & Astronomy, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD 21218, USA

⁴ Anton Pannekoek Institute for Astronomy, University of Amsterdam, Science Park 904, 1098 XH Amsterdam, The Netherlands

⁵ Cosmic Dawn Center (DAWN)

⁶ Niels Bohr Institute, University of Copenhagen, Jagtvej 128, 2100 Copenhagen Ø, Denmark

⁷ DTU Space, National Space Institute, Technical University of Denmark, DK-2800 Kongens Lyngby, Denmark

⁸ INAF – IASF/Milano, via Corti 12, I-20133 Milano, Italy

⁹ Department of Physics & Astronomy and Leicester Institute of Space & Earth Observation, University of Leicester, University Road, Leicester LE1 7RH, UK

Received ... / Accepted ...

ABSTRACT

Aims. We present the updated census and statistics of Lyman- α emitting long gamma-ray bursts host galaxies (LAE-LGRBs). We investigate the properties of a sub-sample of LAE-LGRBs and test the shell model commonly used to fit Lyman- α ($\text{Ly}\alpha$) emission line spectra.

Methods. To perform the census we use all the LGRB host galaxies with relevant information presented in the literature or publicly available. Among the LAE-LGRBs detected to date, we select a *golden sample* of four LAE-LGRBs (GRBs: 011211, 021004, 060926, 070110) allowing us to retrieve information on the host galaxy properties and of its interstellar medium gas, through the combination of the analysis of their afterglow and host galaxy observations. We fit their $\text{Ly}\alpha$ spectra using the shell model, and constrain its parameters with the observed values.

Results. The census results in 29 LAE-LGRBs detected to date. Among them, we present five new $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emission detections in host-galaxy spectra and the corresponding unpublished VLT/X-shooter data (GRBs: 060926, 070110, 081121, 081222 and 100424A). From the comparison of the statistics and properties of LAE-LGRBs to those of LAE samples in the literature, we find evidences of $\text{Ly}\alpha$ suppression in dusty systems, and a fraction of LAE-LGRBs among the overall LGRB hosts lower than that found for Lyman-break galaxy (LBG) samples at similar redshift range. This result can be explained by the different selection criteria of the parent samples and by the shallower spectral observations of LGRB samples compared to LBG ones. However, we find that LAE-LGRBs are representative of $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emission from the bulk of UV-selected galaxies at $z \sim 2$. We find that the *golden sample* of LAE-LGRBs studied here are complex systems characterized by multiple emission blobs and by signs of possible galaxy interactions. The fitting procedure recovers the HI column densities (N_{HI}) measured from the afterglow spectra, and the other properties described by the shell-model parameters in the two low- N_{HI} cases, but it fails in doing so in the other two with high N_{HI} . The afterglows of most LGRBs and LAE-LGRBs show $\log(N_{\text{HI}}/\text{cm}^{-2}) > 20.3$, implying that statistically the bulk of $\text{Ly}\alpha$ photons expected to be produced by massive stars in the star-forming region hosting the GRB will be surrounded by such opaque lines of sight. We therefore interpret our results in the context of more sophisticated models and of different dominant $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emitting regions. We also compare LAE-LGRBs to LAE Lyman continuum (LyC) leakers in the literature in terms of properties identified as possible indirect indicators of LyC leakage. We find that only one LGRB (GRB 021004) would be a likely strong LyC leaker and discuss the validity of such indicators at high redshift.

Key words. gamma-ray burst: general – galaxies: star formation – galaxies: ISM – galaxies: evolution – galaxies: high-redshift – line: profiles

1. Introduction

Due to its brightness and rest-frame wavelength, the Lyman- α ($\text{Ly}\alpha$) emission line is one of the most used features to detect high-redshift galaxies (e.g., Ouchi et al. 2009; Sobral et al. 2015; Zitrin et al. 2015; Bagley et al. 2017). The natural connection of this line with the UV emission from star-forming regions makes it an interesting proxy to study the escape of Lyman continuum

(LyC; $<912 \text{ \AA}$). Indeed, recent studies, such as those of Verhamme et al. (2015, 2017), show that this line is one of the most reliable indirect indicators of ionizing photon leakage.

To escape a galaxy, the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ photons produced in star-forming regions have to pass through the gas where they are embedded. As this radiation resonantly scatters in the presence of neutral hydrogen and is easily absorbed by dust, the journey of photons in the interstellar and circumgalactic medium (ISM and CGM, respectively) can be complex. Nevertheless, different

* Hubble fellow

properties can favour their escape such as low neutral-hydrogen (HI) column densities, low dust content or suitable ISM geometries and kinematics (e.g., Kunth et al. 1998; Shapley et al. 2003; Verhamme et al. 2008; Wofford et al. 2013; Henry et al. 2015; Rivera-Thorsen et al. 2015). As a consequence, the Ly α line flux and profile reflect the signatures of the physical and dynamical properties of the gas and dust content of the Ly α emitters and their surrounding environment. Interpreting the line is complex, and radiative transfer models which take into account the different sources of distortion of the intrinsic profile are necessary to recover the physical meaning of the observed line. A simple and successful model, commonly used to reproduce the Ly α shape, is the shell model (e.g., Ahn 2004; Verhamme et al. 2006; Schaerer et al. 2011; Gronke et al. 2015). It consists of an homogeneous expanding shell of neutral hydrogen and dust surrounding a central emitting source.

While successful in reproducing the line profile (see e.g., Verhamme et al. 2008; Lidman et al. 2012; Yang et al. 2017; Gronke 2017), it is important to test whether the best-fit parameters values of the shell model correspond to the real characteristics of the Ly α -emitting galaxies. Orlitová et al. (2018) highlighted discrepancies between modelling results and observed double-peaked Ly α lines, by constraining independently 5 out of the 7 shell-model parameters with ancillary data, for twelve Green Pea (GP) galaxies at $z \sim 0.2$. In particular, the constrained model neither reproduces the observed blue peak of the line correctly nor, in half of the cases, the red peak. For the prediction of the parameters in the unconstrained case, the main discrepant values are the redshift, the $\text{FWHM}_i(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ and the velocity expansion of the shell. Similar discrepancies for the $\text{FWHM}_i(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ were also found by Hashimoto et al. (2015) for double peak Ly α profiles of galaxies at $z \sim 2.2$. This work emphasises that the use of the shell model to interpret the Ly α line and retrieve physical properties, such as N_{HI} , must proceed cautiously to avoid misinterpretation. It also suggests that considering an homogeneous shell to describe star-forming regions and their surrounding gas could be too simplistic.

The simultaneous availability of the information needed to constrain the model parameters is rare, especially at high redshift. Two individual studies of lensed galaxies at redshift $z = 2.7$ allowed to interpret the Ly α line using partially constrained shell model (Schaerer & Verhamme 2008; Dessauges-Zavadsky et al. 2010). The fitting of the Ly α line is in good agreement with the observation in the study of Dessauges-Zavadsky et al. (2010), while it requires different expansion velocities for the front and the back of the modelled shell in Schaefer & Verhamme (2008).

Gamma-ray bursts (GRBs) can be a useful additional tool to investigate Ly α emission and test the shell model at high redshift. GRBs are the most extreme cosmic electromagnetic phenomena (see Gehrels & Razzaque 2013 for a review). Their brightness makes them powerful probes through the cosmic history since they can be detected up to the highest redshifts (the spectroscopic record holder is GRB 080423 at $z = 8.2$; Salvaterra et al. 2009; Tanvir et al. 2009). In the case of long GRBs (LGRBs), the energy powering the bursts is released during the core-collapse of massive stars (e.g., Hjorth et al. 2003). In addition, several studies indicate that LGRBs have the tendency to occur in dwarf galaxies with high specific star-formation rates and prefer low-metallicity environments, typically sub-solar (e.g., Perley et al. 2016b; Japelj et al. 2016; Graham & Fruchter 2017; Vergani et al. 2017; Palmerio et al. 2019). This makes LGRB hosts likely representative of the common galaxies at high redshift, including during the epoch of reionization (Salvaterra et al. 2011, 2013; Tanvir et al. 2019).

The bright afterglows associated with LGRBs provide ideal background lights to probe systematically and at any redshift the ISM, CGM and inter-galactic medium (IGM) along the line of sight of this population of faint galaxies. The absorption present in the afterglow spectra directly traces the environment of the star-forming regions and also outflows or inflows even for the faintest objects. Once the afterglow has faded, the host galaxy can be directly observed through photometry and spectroscopy. This offers the interesting possibility of combining information on the cold and warm gas with the emission properties of the GRB host galaxy (e.g., Vergani et al. 2011; Chen 2012; Friis et al. 2015; Wiseman et al. 2017; Arabsalmani et al. 2018).

In this work, (i) we update the statistics of Ly α -emitting (LAE¹) LGRB host galaxies and compare their properties with those of LGRB hosts in general, and of LAEs and LyC leakers in the literature; (ii) we use a *golden sample* of four LAE-LGRBs at $2 < z < 3.2$ allowing the combination of the emission properties of the host galaxies with the information on the ISM probed by the afterglow, to investigate the properties of such systems and test the Ly α radiative transfer modelling.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present a statistical study on LAEs in LGRB hosts. We describe the physical properties of the host galaxies of our *golden sample* in Section 3 and the Ly α radiative transfer model results in Section 4. In section 5, we discuss the differences between model predictions and observations, and we compare LAE-LGRBs to LGRB hosts in general and to LAEs and LyC-leaker galaxies in the literature. We draw our conclusions in Section 6.

All errors are reported at 1σ confidence unless stated otherwise. We consider a Λ CDM cosmology with the cosmological parameters provided in Planck Collaboration et al. (2016): $H_0 = 67.8 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$, $\Omega_m = 0.308$ and $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.692$.

2. LAE detections in LGRB systems

2.1. Previous studies and approach

The early studies of high-redshift GRB host galaxies, based on the first sample of five objects, (Kulkarni et al. 1998; Fynbo et al. 2002; Møller et al. 2002; Fynbo et al. 2003; Vreeswijk et al. 2004), seemed to indicate that all GRB hosts were LAEs. A subsequent systematic study, based on the larger TOUGH sample (Hjorth et al. 2012; sixty-nine LGRB host galaxies), has been carried out by Milvang-Jensen et al. (2012). They targeted a sub-sample of twenty LGRB hosts in the redshift range $z = 1.8 - 4.5$ for VLT/FORS1 (Appenzeller et al. 1998) spectral observations. They found seven LGRB hosts with significant Ly α emission (3σ detection), corresponding to 35% LAEs.

The first step of our work is to update the census of LAE-LGRBs. To this end we considered two approaches: (i) a determination of the LAE statistics considering spectroscopic samples of LGRB host galaxies or afterglows; (ii) the search for LAE-LGRBs in the literature and from the host-galaxy spectra available in the ESO archive². In both cases, we consider a minimum value of $z = 1.6$ for the LGRBs, which corresponds to the atmospheric UV cutoff at 310 nm and is the lower-redshift limit allowing the detection of the Ly α line in the VLT/X-shooter

¹ In the literature Ly α -emitting galaxies are usually defined as Ly α emitters (LAEs) when their rest-frame Ly α emission equivalent width ($\text{EW}_0(\text{Ly}\alpha)$) is above a certain threshold (typically 20 Å) because historically they were selected from narrow band observations. In this study, we qualify Ly α -emitting galaxies as LAEs independently of their ($\text{EW}_0(\text{Ly}\alpha)$).

² <http://archive.eso.org/cms.html>

spectra³. The samples considered for point (i) are the TOUGH, the *X-shooter host-galaxy sample* (Krühler et al. 2015, XHG in the following) and the *X-shooter afterglow sample* (Selsing et al. 2019; XAFT in the following).

We stress that the census presented in the following sections (especially in Sect. 2.5) may not reflect the general statistics of LAEs among LGRB host galaxies. In addition to issues concerning the completeness of the samples and of the observations, the spectra are generally not homogeneous in terms of exposure times, instruments and observing conditions. Nonetheless, sometimes it is possible to define a common flux limit, as in the case of Milvang-Jensen et al. (2012) sample. The case of afterglow spectra is even more complex as, in addition to inhomogeneous follow-up and target brightness, the Ly α absorption along the GRB line of sight could affect the Ly α emission detection and profile.

2.2. Data reduction

To perform the census, we reduced archival data of several X-shooter spectra of GRB host galaxies. We describe here the method applied for the data reduction. All observations of the host galaxies, the telluric stars, and the spectrophotometric standards were reduced in the same way using the version 2.8.5 of the X-shooter data reduction pipeline (Modigliani et al. 2010). Before processing the spectra through the pipeline, the cosmic-ray hits and bad-pixels were removed following the method of van Dokkum (2001). Then, we subtracted the bias from all raw frames and divided them by the master flat field. We traced the echelle orders and calibrated the data in spatial and wavelength units using arc-line lamps. The flux calibration was done using spectrophotometric standards (Vernet et al. 2009) and a correction for flexure was applied. Lastly, the sky-subtraction and the rectification and merging of the orders was done to obtain the final two-dimensional spectra. Additionally, the spectra were corrected for the Milky Way (MW) extinction using the extinction curve from Pei (1992). The A_V values are obtained from the NASA Extragalactic Database (NED) and correspond to the extinction map of Schlafly & Finkbeiner (2011). The wavelengths of the extracted 1D-spectra were converted in the vacuum reference and corrected for the Earth's rotation and revolution around the Sun (heliocentric correction). To optimally select the extraction regions we chose the spatial extension of the brightest emission line and applied this 1D extraction throughout the whole spectrum. When the Ly α line is detected, we selected the extraction region according to the spatial extension of this line which can be larger than Balmer lines due to resonant scattering. Emission line fluxes were determined by fitting a Gaussian function to the data, setting the continuum flux density in a region close to the emission line. We also numerically integrated the flux over the line width as a comparison to control the consistency of the values and uncertainties. For the asymmetric line-profile of the Ly α line, we use a skewed Gaussian parametrized as described in Vielfaure et al. (2020). When lines of interest were not detected, we estimated a 3σ upper limit. For upper limits of nebular emissions, we use a FWHM in agreement with other nebular lines detected in the spectrum. For Ly α line, similarly to Milvang-Jensen et al. (2012), we select the same width for all upper limits which

is 900 km s^{-1} centered at 300 km s^{-1} . The fluxes have been corrected for slit loss by calculating the flux difference between the observation of a telluric star (close in time and space to the observation of the GRB host, and with the same instrumental setup) to the tabulated values⁴ expected to be measured.

2.3. The TOUGH sample

We first focus on the TOUGH sample of 69 GRBs. The TOUGH Ly α study (Milvang-Jensen et al. 2012) targeted the 20 GRBs with a redshift in the range $z = 1.8 - 4.5$, as known at the time of the Ly α observing campaign. Subsequently as part of other TOUGH campaigns (Jakobsson et al. 2012; Krühler et al. 2012) and later work (Krühler et al. 2015) the redshift completeness of TOUGH has increased to 60/69 (Krühler et al. 2015). With respect to Milvang-Jensen et al. (2012), this includes adding redshifts for eleven TOUGH GRBs in the range $z = 1.8 - 4.5$ (GRB: 050714B, 050819, 050915A, 051001, 060805A, 060814, 070103, 070129, 070224, 070328 and 070419B); all these hosts have VLT/X-shooter spectra.

We reduced the X-shooter data, as described in Sect. 2.2, to look for the detection of Ly α emission. We find no LAEs among these eleven additional host galaxies. The new statistic of LAEs among LGRB host galaxies of the TOUGH sample is therefore $23\% \pm 7\%$.

Taking into account the fact that the spectra have different flux limits (see Fig. 1 and 2), we determine the statistics of Ly α detection above a flux cut of $1.12 \times 10^{-17} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ (corresponding to the lowest Ly α detection of the TOUGH sample), a luminosity cut of $5.6 \times 10^{41} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ (corresponding to the flux cut at the median redshift of the TOUGH sample, $z = 2.45$), and the fraction of LAEs among the sample with a rest-frame Ly α EW $> 20 \text{ \AA}$. To estimate the uncertainty on these statistics, based on the sample sizes, we perform a bootstrap method employing 10^6 random resamples with replacement of the number of LAEs among the LGRBs considered for each cut. The results are reported in Table 1.

In principle, we can look for Ly α emission also at $z > 4.5$. This would add three further objects from the TOUGH sample. They lack host galaxy spectral observations but these have afterglow spectra available in the literature (GRB 050904: Totani et al. 2006; GRB 060522: Tanvir et al. 2019; GRB 060927: Fynbo et al. 2009). They show no Ly α emission but formal limits have not been determined.

2.4. The XHG and XAFT samples

Krühler et al. (2015) presented the UVB-arm spectra for only three objects at $z > 1.6$ of their XHG sample. Therefore, we reduce all the UVB spectra of the sample (following the procedure described in Sect. 2.2) and inspect them to look for Ly α emission. We find three LAEs among the 37 host galaxy spectra at $z > 1.6$, corresponding to $8\% \pm 6\%$ (see also Fig. 1). They are GRB 060926, GRB 070110 and GRB 100424A (also reported in Malesani et al. 2013). We will focus in more details on GRB 060926 and GRB 070110 in Sections 3.3 and 3.4. The unpublished 1D and 2D spectra of the host of GRB 100424A, showing its Ly α detection, are reported in Fig. 3. The flux of the line corrected for Galactic extinction and slit loss is $F_{\text{Ly}\alpha} = (3.4 \pm 0.5) \times 10^{-17} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$. The flux limits are much less

³ In our study the VLT/X-shooter spectrograph (Vernet et al. 2011) is particularly interesting for its wide spectral coverage (from $\sim 300 \text{ nm}$ to 2500 nm) allowing the simultaneous detection of absorption lines in the ISM of the host galaxy and associated nebular emission lines for a large range of redshifts, with a medium spectral resolution of $R \sim 5000$.

⁴ The tabulated values of the magnitudes for the telluric stars have been taken from <https://www.eso.org/sci/facilities/paranal/decommissioned/isaac/tools/spectra/Bstars.txt> and <http://simbad.u-strasbg.fr/simbad/>

homogeneous than for the TOUGH sample. We apply the same cuts as for the TOUGH sample and summarize the statistics in Table 1.

Finally, focusing on the XAFT sample, Selsing et al. (2019) report the detection of four LAEs (GRBs 121201A, 150915A, 151021A, 170202A) among their X-shooter afterglow sample of 41 LGRBs, corresponding to $10\% \pm 5\%$.




Fig. 1. *Top Panel:* $\text{Ly}\alpha$ fluxes of LAE-LGRBs as a function of redshift. We report the fluxes retrieved from the literature or determined in this paper (see the tables in Appendix A). For the TOUGH and XHG samples, we plot also the upper limits of the host galaxies with no $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emission detection (empty symbols). *Bottom Panel:* $\text{Ly}\alpha$ luminosity of the LAE-LGRBs as a function of rest-frame $\text{Ly}\alpha$ equivalent width ($\text{EW}_0(\text{Ly}\alpha)$). The sample and symbols used are the same as in the top panel.

2.5. Overall detections

The results of the three samples presented above are detailed in the tables of Appendix A. By merging them and removing the overlapping cases, we find 14 LAEs out of 84 LGRB host and afterglow spectra. The statistics on the LAE-LGRBs (restricted to the host galaxy spectra only) are summarized in Table 1.

To complete the census, we should add to this merged sample the complementary LAE-LGRBs individually reported in the lit-




Fig. 2. *Top Panel:* cumulative number of galaxies in the TOUGH (orange line), XHG (blue line), and merged samples (TOUGH+XHG, green) without overlapping GRBs, as a function of $\text{Ly}\alpha$ luminosity detection threshold (3σ) of the spectra. The dashed lines represent the number of detected LAEs, above the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ luminosity threshold, in each sample. *Bottom Panel:* fraction of detected LAEs for each sample as function of $\text{Ly}\alpha$ luminosity threshold.

erature. To this purpose, we selected from two GRB databases⁵, maintained by D. Perley and J. Greiner, all LGRBs detected until December 1, 2020, with a spectroscopic redshift $z > 1.6$. This results in 234 LGRBs (see Fig. 4) with 193 having a spectrum covering the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ line and for which it is possible for us to verify whether the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emission is detected. For those not included in the sample presented in the previous sections, we searched the literature for articles or Gamma-ray Coordinates Network (GCN⁶) Circulars claiming a detection of $\text{Ly}\alpha$ line. If unpublished spectra were available in the ESO archive, we retrieved and reduced them.

Overall we found thirteen additional LAE-LGRBs from the literature, and two LAE-LGRBs from unpublished data: GRB 081121 at $z = 2.5134$ and 081222 $z = 2.770$. Both objects have X-shooter spectra (Prog. ID: 097.D-0672; PI: S.D. Vergani). We reduced the data following the procedure described in Sect. 2.2. Their $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emission is shown in Fig. 3. The measured $\text{Ly}\alpha$ fluxes of GRB 081121 and 081222 corrected for Galactic extinction and slit loss are $F_{\text{Ly}\alpha} = (4.9 \pm 0.5) \times 10^{-17} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ and $F_{\text{Ly}\alpha} = (1.6 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-17} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$, respectively. Additionally to the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ line, GRB 081121 shows the presence of the [OII] doublet, [OIII] $\lambda 5007$ and $\text{H}\beta$ lines. Residual sky lines contaminate strongly the [OIII] $\lambda 4959$ line and partially $\text{H}\beta$. We determine $F_{[\text{OII}]} = (1.4 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-17} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$, $F_{[\text{OIII}]\lambda 5007} = (9.0 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-17} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ and $F_{\text{H}\beta} \leq 1.2 \times 10^{-17} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ (all corrected for Galactic extinction and slit loss).

In total, to date, there are 29 confirmed LAE-LGRBs (see Fig. 1 and 4). Eleven of them have $\text{EW}_0 > 20 \text{ \AA}$, five are below this threshold and the continuum flux measurement is lacking for the rest of them. Table B.1 of the Appendix gives a summary

⁵ <http://www.astro.caltech.edu/grbox/grbox.php> and <http://www.mpe.mpg.de/~jcg/grbgen.html>

⁶ <https://gcn.gsfc.nasa.gov/>

Table 1. Fraction of LAEs among GRB host galaxies from the TOUGH and XHG samples.

Sample	f_{tot}	f_f	f_L	f_{EW_0}
TOUGH	$23\% \pm 7\%$ (7/31)	$28\% \pm 8\%$ (7/25)	$39\% \pm 11\%$ (7/18)	$17\% \pm 7\%$ (5/30)
XHG	$8\% \pm 6\%$ (3/37)	$19\% \pm 13\%$ (3/16)	$19\% \pm 13\%$ (3/16)	$7\% \pm 4\%$ (2/28)
TOUGH + XHG	$17\% \pm 6\%$ (9/53)	$27\% \pm 9\%$ (9/33)	$36\% \pm 8\%$ (9/25)	$14\% \pm 5\%$ (6/42)

Notes. The first column corresponds to the name of the sample: TOUGH, XHG or merged samples without overlapping GRBs (TOUGH + XHG). f_{tot} : fraction of LAEs among the whole sample; f_f : fraction of LAEs among the sample with a flux cut of $1.12 \times 10^{-17} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$; f_L : fraction of LAEs among the sample with a luminosity cut of $5.6 \times 10^{41} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$; f_{EW_0} : fraction of LAEs among the sample with a rest-frame $\text{Ly}\alpha$ EW $> 20 \text{ \AA}$. Due to undetected continuum, seven $\text{Ly}\alpha$ EW₀ measurements are missing for the TOUGH sample and eleven for the XHG sample. The fractions between brackets correspond to the number of LAEs over the size of the sample after applying the corresponding cuts. The uncertainty on the percentage of LAEs is calculated by bootstrap method (see Sect. 2.3).




Fig. 3. Section of the 2D and 1D X-shooter-UVB spectra, not previously published, showing the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emission line from the host galaxy of GRB 100424A (top), GRB 081121 (middle) and GRB 081222 (bottom). The lines are plotted in velocity frame centered at the systemic redshift of the galaxy (except for GRB 081222, centered on the redshift determined from the GRB afterglow absorption lines, as no other emission lines are detected). The flux density F_λ is in units of $10^{-17} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ \AA}^{-1}$.

of the LAE-LGRBs and their $\text{Ly}\alpha$ fluxes. These fluxes should be considered as lower limits. It is well known (Fynbo et al. e.g., 1999; Steidel et al. e.g., 2011; Wisotzki et al. e.g., 2016; Leclercq et al. e.g., 2017) that a significant fraction of the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emission of high-redshift galaxies takes place in $\text{Ly}\alpha$ halos extending several kpc away of the galaxy. In our measurements we consider only the flux falling in the slit, without any correction taking into account the spatial distribution of the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emission of our objects (unknown for almost all of them).




Fig. 4. Redshift distribution of the 29 LAE-LGRBs (blue) among the 464 LGRBs with a spectroscopic or photometric redshift measurement (black line; as up to December 1 2020). The histograms are superimposed and not cumulative.

2.6. Comparison of LAE-LGRB properties to LGRBs that are not LAEs and LAEs that are not LGRB hosts

LGRB host galaxies are selected in principle only based on the fact that they host a LGRB explosion. Therefore, they are star-forming systems, with a young star formation, and preferentially with sub-solar metallicity (see e.g., Lyman et al. 2017; Palmerio et al. 2019). In the following, we look at LAE-LGRB statistics and compare it to those of LAEs in galaxy surveys at a similar redshift range to see if these systems have an enhanced or suppressed $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emission compared to the general population of star-forming galaxies. We also compare the properties of the LAE-LGRBs to those of LGRB host galaxies not showing $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emission (Fig. 5) to try to identify possible driving factors of $\text{Ly}\alpha$ escape. We stress that in some cases only a small fraction of objects in our samples have available information to be used for such comparison. We refer the reader to Tables in Appendix A for the values and references of properties discussed in the following and shown in Fig. 5.

In the survey of galaxies at $z \sim 2$ presented by Steidel et al. (2004), 40% of galaxies with available spectra show the presence of $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emission (are LAEs) and 10% have $\text{EW}_0(\text{Ly}\alpha) > 20 \text{ \AA}$ (Erb et al. 2014). Reddy et al. (2008) found 65% LAEs for LBGs at $z \sim 3$, and 23% with $\text{EW}_0(\text{Ly}\alpha) > 20 \text{ \AA}$. Pentericci et al. (2010) found a fraction of 50% LAEs in their selected GOODMUSIC LBG sample at $z \sim 3$, and 18% with $\text{EW}_0(\text{Ly}\alpha) > 20 \text{ \AA}$. The LAE statistics of the TOUGH and XHG samples presented in previous sub-sections of Sect. 2 is lower than that of those




Fig. 5. Distribution of the M_{UV} (left panel), stellar masses (middle panel) and SFR (right panel) of the overall LAE-LGRBs (black solid line). The colored areas inside the black histogram correspond to the LAEs detected in the TOUGH (yellow), XHG (blue) and other LAE-LGRBs outside these two samples (red). The dashed blue area is for GRB 070110 which is detected in both TOUGH and XHG samples. The colored areas are cumulative and not superimposed. The overall TOUGH and XHG distribution are represented by the yellow and blue empty histograms, respectively. The green histogram is the sum of the TOUGH and XHG samples. The arrows represent limits and the yellow stars are for the *golden sample* presented in Sect. 3.

studies (see Table 1, column f_{tot}). However, the selection criteria of the parent sample are not the same and may contribute to this difference. Most of the above-mentioned studies are based on galaxies with magnitude brighter than $R = 25.5$ mag. This corresponds to the median value of the TOUGH sample, and about a half of TOUGH LAEs are fainter galaxies. If we apply this selection to the TOUGH sample (hence reduced to 17 objects) we obtain a fraction of $22\% \pm 15\%$ LAEs and $7\% \pm 7\%$ LAEs having $EW_0(Ly\alpha) > 20 \text{ \AA}$. Those numbers should be considered as lower limits as the $Ly\alpha$ flux limit reached by the Steidel et al. (2003, 2004) spectroscopic survey is deeper than ours (typically $\sim 10^{-18} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ instead of $\sim 10^{-17} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$). The fraction of LAEs in the TOUGH sample could be as high as 47%, assuming that all the objects with flux limit values above that of the weakest detected $Ly\alpha$ are all LAEs. Therefore, the lower statistics found for LGRB samples than for galaxy surveys could be explained by the different $Ly\alpha$ flux limits. The magnitude selection of Pentericci et al. (2010) reaches $R = 26$ mag. Applying the same cut to the TOUGH sample would not change so much the results compared to the $R = 25.5$ mag cut.

We do not find any particular correlation of the LGRB host galaxy properties (stellar mass, SFR, metallicity, UV magnitude, dust extinction or H I column density along LGRB line of sight) with $Ly\alpha$ luminosity or EW_0 , but our results are limited by the poor statistics. As shown in Fig. 5, whenever the information on the SFR of LAE-LGRBs is available, its value is below $30 M_\odot \text{ yr}^{-1}$, except for GRB 080602 which has a lower limit of $48 M_\odot \text{ yr}^{-1}$ (Palmerio et al. 2019). If we focus on stellar masses, we see that LAE-LGRBs are associated preferentially with stellar masses $M_\star < 10^{10} M_\odot$, as also found by Pentericci et al. (2010) for LBG samples at $z \sim 3$. However, due to the poor statistics we cannot conclude if this is an intrinsic properties of LAEs or a consequence of the characteristics of the parent samples.

The low fraction of LAEs in the XHG sample is likely due to the difference in the M_{UV} and stellar mass range covered by the TOUGH and XHG samples. Indeed, by construction, the latter is biased towards LGRBs with highly extinguished afterglows (Krühler et al. 2015), that on average may originate in more massive and dusty galaxies. Over the 30 objects of the XHG sample having information on $E(B-V)$ (even if with large errors), 70% have $E(B-V)$ values higher than the most extinguished LAE-LGRB in the sample. This is consistent with the fact that dust

is considered having a significant impact on $Ly\alpha$ suppression (Neufeld 1990; Laursen et al. 2009) and that LAEs are preferentially found in systems with low extinction (e.g., Shapley et al. 2003; Pentericci et al. 2007, 2010; Matthee et al. 2016). The metallicities of the LAE-LGRBs also support this trend as their values are among the lowest values of the TOUGH and XHG sample (see Appendix A).




Fig. 6. Distribution of luminosities of LAE-LGRBs and LAEs of the XLS-z2 sample (Matthee et al. 2021) as a function of the galaxy UV absolute magnitude. Systems having $EW_0 > 25 \text{ \AA}$ are shown with black bold contours. The remaining LAEs have fainter or undetermined EW_0 .

Matthee et al. (2021) predicted that the bulk of $Ly\alpha$ population of UV galaxies with $M_{1500} \sim -20 \pm 1$ at $z = 2$ should be below $\sim 2 \times 10^{42} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$, and the fraction of LAEs with $EW_0 > 25 \text{ \AA}$ should be of 10 – 30%. We can see in Fig. 6 that most of the TOUGH unbiased sample of LGRB hosts is below this limit. This is due to the fact that LGRB samples have no pre-selection except for the LGRB explosions. Therefore, LAE-LGRBs are representative of $Ly\alpha$ emission from the bulk of UV-selected galaxies at $z \sim 2$. Furthermore, the fraction of LAEs with EW_0




Fig. 7. Images of the fields of the four LAE-LGRBs of the *golden sample*. The slit position of the afterglow (dashed lines) and host galaxy spectra (solid line) are superimposed. The afterglow position is represented by a circle (Jakobsson et al. 2003; Fox 2002; Holland et al. 2006; Malesani et al. 2007, for GRB 011211, 021004, 060926 and 070110, respectively). GRB 011211 field: HST/STIS image (Prog. ID: 8867; P.I.: S.R. Kulkarni); GRB 021004 field: HST/ACS WFC2 F814 image (Prog. ID: 9405; P.I.: A. Fruchter); GRB 060926A field: VLT/FORS1 image (Prog. ID: 079.A-0253(A); P.I.: P. Jakobsson); GRB 070110 field: VLT/FORS2 image (Prog. ID: 098.D-0416(A); P.I.: S. Schulze).

Table 2. Observing log of the observations of the four GRB host galaxy spectra of the *golden sample* analysed in this paper.

GRB host	Redshift	Exposure time (s)			Slit width			PA (deg)	Obs. date	Seeing (")	Airmass
		UVB	VIS	NIR	UVB	VIS	NIR				
GRB 011211	2.1434	4 × 1800	4 × 1800	4 × 900	1.0	0.9	0.9	101	2010-03-18	0.5	1.4
GRB 021004	2.3298	4 × 1200	4 × 1200	8 × 650	1.6	1.5	1.5	41	2009-11-21	1.3	1.4
GRB 060926	3.2090	2 × 1800	2 × 1800	6 × 600	1.0	0.9	0.9	47	2010-04-18	0.8	1.3
GRB 070110	2.3523	4 × 1680	4 × 1680	8 × 840	1.0	0.9	0.9	42	2010-10-29	0.8	1.4

Notes. The columns indicate the GRB name, redshift determined from emission lines (see Sect. 3), exposure time, slit width and position angle (PA) used in this study, as well as the observing date, average seeing and airmass of the observations.

> 25 Å among the TOUGH sample is of ~ 25%, in agreement with Matthee et al. (2021) expectations for UV-selected galaxies.

3. The golden sample

One of the strengths of GRBs is that they give us the possibility to combine the information on the host galaxy gas retrieved from the afterglow spectra with that obtained through direct host galaxy observations, once the afterglow faded. This advantage can be useful to characterize LAE-LGRBs and to test Ly α models.

For this purpose, we selected from the census presented in Sect. 2 a *golden sample* of LAE-LGRBs fulfilling the following criteria:

- (i) Availability of both afterglow and host galaxy spectra;
- (ii) Ly α detection in the afterglow or host galaxy spectra with spectral resolution $R > 1000$, as lower resolution can lead to a misinterpretation of the line profile (e.g., Verhamme et al. 2015; Gronke et al. 2015);
- (iii) Detection of other host galaxy emission lines in order to determine the systemic redshift of the galaxy, the intrinsic Ly α and galaxy properties.

Table 3. Fluxes of Balmer and oxygen lines and derived properties.

GRB host	H β [10^{-17} erg s $^{-1}$ cm $^{-2}$]	H α [10^{-17} erg s $^{-1}$ cm $^{-2}$]	[OII] λ 3726, 3729 [10^{-17} erg s $^{-1}$ cm $^{-2}$]	[OIII] λ 4959, 5007 [10^{-17} erg s $^{-1}$ cm $^{-2}$]	[OIII]/[OII]	SFR [M_{\odot} yr $^{-1}$]
GRB 011211	< 0.4*	< 1.2	< 1.6	2.7 ± 0.3	> 1.7	< 2.0
GRB 021004	$1.2 \pm 0.2^*$	3.3 ± 0.4	< 1.7	16.9 ± 0.5	> 10	6.7 ± 0.9
GRB 060926	1.6 ± 0.3	$4.6 \pm 0.9^*$	$2.3 \pm 0.4^{\#}$	$3.5 \pm 0.4^{\dagger}$	1.5 ± 0.4	20.2 ± 4.0
GRB 070110	$0.3 \pm 0.2^*$	0.9 ± 0.4	$1.8 \pm 0.3^{\#}$	4.0 ± 0.3	2.2 ± 0.4	1.9 ± 0.6

Notes. Fluxes are corrected for Galactic extinction and slit loss. No correction for host-intrinsic extinction is applied. Upper limits are at 3σ . *: flux estimated using $H\alpha = 2.86 \times H\beta$. † : [OIII] λ 4959 line not detected. We fixed its flux as being 1/3 of the [OIII] λ 5007 flux. $^{\#}$: [OII] λ 3729 line falling on a sky line. We fixed its flux as being 3/2 of the [OII] λ 3726 flux.

Table 4. Fluxes and properties of the observed Ly α emission line.

GRB host	F(Ly α) [10^{-17} erg s $^{-1}$ cm $^{-2}$]	EW $_0$ (Ly α) [Å]	FWHM $_0$ (Ly α) [km s $^{-1}$]	Ly α red-peak shift [km s $^{-1}$]	f_{esc} (Ly α)	F_i (Ly α) [10^{-17} erg s $^{-1}$ cm $^{-2}$]
GRB 011211	1.6 ± 0.2	14 ± 3	249 ± 60	280 ± 30	> 0.16	< 10.4
GRB 021004	16.9 ± 0.3	105 ± 10	228 ± 20	180 ± 20	0.59 ± 0.08	28.8 ± 3.5
GRB 060926	5.3 ± 0.4	37 ± 7	417 ± 40	250 ± 20	0.13 ± 0.03	40.0 ± 7.9
GRB 070110	2.8 ± 0.5	33 ± 8	412 ± 80	285 ± 40	0.36 ± 0.09	7.8 ± 2.7

Notes. The Ly α fluxes are corrected for Galactic extinction and slit loss. No correction for host-intrinsic extinction is applied. The EW $_0$ (Ly α) and FWHM $_0$ (Ly α) are respectively the rest-frame equivalent width and FWHM of the observed Ly α line. The Ly α red-peak shift is the velocity shift of the Ly α peak redward the theoretical Ly α line center, as calculated from the systemic redshift of the galaxy (see Table 2). The escape fraction of Ly α photons (f_{esc} (Ly α)) and the intrinsic flux of the Ly α line (F_i (Ly α)) are determined from Balmer lines as described in Sect. 3. We stress that these escape fractions are not corrected for dust extinction as explained in Sect. 3.

We stress the importance of X-shooter observations to fulfill point (iii), thanks to its wide spectral coverage from ~ 300 nm to 2500 nm.

We find only four objects fulfilling the above-mentioned criteria: GRBs 011211, 021004 (reported independently in the literature), 060926 (part of the XHG sample), and 070110 (part of both the XHG and TOUGH sample). The images of their fields, with the slits used to obtain the afterglow and host-galaxy spectra, are shown in Fig. 7. We reduced the X-shooter spectra of the four GRB hosts (see log of the observations in Table 2) and measured the emission line fluxes (reported in Table 3 and 4) accordingly to the procedure described in Sect. 2.2. These fluxes only represent the Ly α photons falling in the slit, without applying any correction to take into account the two-dimensional spatial extension of the Ly α emission. If we consider a 2D-Gaussian approximation, the resulting fluxes would be on average a factor ~ 2 higher. The Ly α fluxes of these host galaxies have previously been reported in Milvang-Jensen et al. (2012). Our measurements using X-shooter spectra provide lower values but consistent within the uncertainties (at 2 or 3 σ). This is a good agreement, taking into account that different observing techniques and slit position angles may cover different parts of the diffuse Ly α emission.

For each host galaxy we determined the star-formation rate (SFR) (or put limits on it), and the Ly α properties by the following method. We used the H α flux (measured or converted from the H β flux, assuming $H\alpha = 2.86 \times H\beta$; Osterbrock 1989) to derive the H α luminosity corrected for Milky Way extinction ($L(H\alpha_{\text{obs}}^{\text{MWcor}})$). We converted the H α luminosity into SFR using the relation from Kennicutt (1998), scaled to the Chabrier (2003) initial mass function as:

$$\text{SFR}(H\alpha) = 4.6 \times 10^{-42} L(H\alpha_{\text{obs}}^{\text{MWcor}}) M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}. \quad (1)$$

We cannot retrieve information on the dust extinction of the four host galaxies from the emission lines, due to the detection of

only one of the Balmer lines (H α or H β) in the spectra. Therefore, the SFR values are determined without applying any host-galaxy dust correction and should be considered as lower limits.

Under the assumption that the Ly α and the Balmer lines originate from the same regions and are produced by the same recombination process, it is possible to infer the intrinsic properties of the Ly α emission line from the H α or H β lines. We determined the FWHM $_i$ (Ly α) from a Gaussian fit of the H α (or H β) line profile that we corrected for instrumental dispersion. In case B recombination, the theoretical ratio between the Ly α and the H α lines is ~ 8.7 (Brocklehurst 1971). Using this value and assuming no extinction, we converted the Balmer flux to intrinsic Ly α flux (F_i (Ly α)). We determined the f_{esc} (Ly α) as the ratio of the observed Ly α flux to the intrinsic one. Following the consideration on Ly α fluxes reported above, the f_{esc} (Ly α) values should be considered as lower limits. The rest-frame Ly α equivalent width (EW $_0$ (Ly α)) is determined by dividing the rest-frame Ly α flux by the Ly α continuum level.

We will detail more on the analysis of the data of each GRB in the following sections. The fluxes of the identified lines, the SFR, and the Ly α emission characteristics are reported in Tables 3 and 4.

In general, we remark that the Ly α emission line profile and velocity spread of our sample (see next sections) are typical of LAEs at $z \sim 2$. Similarly to those of the XLS-z2 sample of LAEs presented in Matthee et al. (2021), they show an asymmetric profile with a prominent peak redshifted from the systemic redshift of the host by $\gtrsim 200$ km s $^{-1}$, and extending over $\gtrsim 500$ km s $^{-1}$. However, the velocity shift of the ISM absorption lines detected in the afterglow spectra with respect to the systemic velocity of the galaxies (~ -100 km s $^{-1}$) are not as high as the the XLS-z2 sample (~ -260 km s $^{-1}$), likely testifying of a more static environment.

3.1. GRB 011211

The photometry of the afterglow and host galaxy of GRB 011211 has been published in Jakobsson et al. (2003). The detection of Ly α emission through narrow-band filters was reported by Fynbo et al. (2003). The host galaxy of GRB 011211 has a multi-component morphology (Jakobsson et al. 2003; Fynbo et al. 2003). The GRB site is in the southeast part of the system, while the Ly α emission peaks in the central-north part of the system and extends over the entire system.

We present here the X-shooter observation of the host galaxy (Prog. ID: 084.A-0631; PI: S. Piranomonte, see Table 2), not previously published. At the afterglow position, we clearly identify the [OIII] $\lambda\lambda$ 4959, 5007 doublet and Ly α line (see Fig. 8). From the [OIII] $\lambda\lambda$ 4959, 5007, we derive a redshift of 2.1434 ± 0.0001 . The Ly α peak is redshifted by 280 ± 30 km s $^{-1}$ compared to the host galaxy redshift. The observed Ly α line properties are reported in Table 4. The spatial extension of the Ly α line in the 2D spectrum is $2''.5$, compared to $1''.8$ for the brightest nebular emission line [OIII] λ 5007. From the 3σ upper limit on the H α flux we determine a SFR < 2.0 M $_{\odot}$ yr $^{-1}$. Perley et al. (2013) obtained an average dust attenuation of $A_V = 0.19^{+0.70}_{-0.00}$ mag from the host galaxy Spectral Energy Distribution (SED) fitting.

The afterglow spectrum shows the detection of the GRB Damped Ly α system (DLA) with $\log(N_{\text{HI}}/\text{cm}^{-2}) = 20.4 \pm 0.2$ (Vreeswijk et al. 2006), with many associated absorption lines. From the low-ionization state lines (LIS) redshift reported by Vreeswijk et al. (2006) we determine the velocity of the ISM with respect to the systemic redshift of the host galaxy, $V_{\text{LIS}} = -160 \pm 180$ km s $^{-1}$, with important uncertainties due to the low resolution of VLT/FORS2 spectra. The Ly α emission peak would fall in the Ly α absorption trough but is not detected in the afterglow spectra, likely due to a combination of line faintness, spectral resolution and noisy spectral region. From the power-law fitting of the afterglow, Jakobsson et al. (2003) determined $A_V = 0.08 \pm 0.08$ mag along the line of sight.

3.2. GRB 021004

The afterglow and host galaxy of GRB 021004 have been intensively observed (see Fynbo et al. 2005 and references therein). Møller et al. (2002), showed the presence of Ly α emission in the optical spectrum of the GRB afterglow, which was later confirmed by many other works (e.g., Mirabal et al. 2003; Starling et al. 2005). The host galaxy of GRB 021004 has a compact core with a faint second component and the GRB site is located at the center of its host (Fynbo et al. 2005). The X-shooter observation of the host galaxy (Prog. ID: 084.A-0631; PI: S. Piranomonte, see Table 2) has previously been published in Vergani et al. (2011). In Fig. 7, we show the image of GRB 021004 field with superimposed the slits used to observe the host galaxy and the afterglow. Vergani et al. (2011) report the detection of [OIII] λ 5007 emission line, at the same redshift as the GRB, from the galaxy eastward of the GRB host in the spectrum obtained with the slit position angle PA=92°. Its proximity to the GRB host (projected distance of 14 kpc) may indicate a possible interaction between this galaxy and the GRB host.

For our analysis we used the X-shooter spectrum obtained with slit PA of 41° that, due to its larger slit width, minimizes the loss of Ly α flux. We reduced the spectrum following the procedure described in Sect. 2, and identify the [OIII] $\lambda\lambda$ 4959, 5007 doublet, H α and Ly α emission lines (see Fig. 8). H β falls exactly on a sky line and the [OII] λ 3727 doublet is not detected (3σ upper limit of 1.7×10^{-17} erg s $^{-1}$ cm $^{-2}$). We derive a redshift of




Fig. 8. Ly α and [OIII] λ 5007 emission lines from the X-shooter spectra of the four GRB host galaxies GRB 011211, 021004, 060926 and 070110 from top to bottom respectively. The lines are centered at the systemic redshift of the galaxy determined from the [OIII] emissions lines. The flux density F_{λ} is in units of 10^{-17} erg s $^{-1}$ cm $^{-2}$ Å $^{-1}$. The bottom panel shows the superposition of the four Ly α lines rebinned to 0.8 Å and normalized to the Ly α line flux.

$z = 2.3298 \pm 0.0001$ for the host galaxy. We estimate the line fluxes and SFR following the procedure described in Sect. 3. We find a SFR = 6.7 ± 0.8 M $_{\odot}$ yr $^{-1}$ (without host extinction correction). The Ly α emission from the host galaxy is an asymmetric line redshifted by 180 ± 20 km s $^{-1}$ with an $\text{EW}_0 = 105 \pm 10$ Å. The spatial extension of the Ly α line in the 2D spectrum is $4''.7$, com-

pared to $2''.0$ for the brightest nebular emission line [OIII] $\lambda 5007$. The SED fitting performed by de Ugarte Postigo et al. (2005) determined $A_V = 0.06^{+0.08}_{-0.06}$ mag, whereas Perley et al. (2013) report $A_V = 0.42^{+0.09}_{-0.07}$ mag.

The Ly α emission is also detected in the afterglow spectrum at the same velocity and with a similar shape profile as that detected in the host galaxy spectrum. The afterglow spectrum shows also the Ly α absorption of the GRB sub-DLA system, with $\log(N_{\text{HI}}/\text{cm}^{-2}) = 19.5 \pm 0.5$ (Fynbo et al. 2005).

The VLT/UVES afterglow spectrum of GRB 021004 presents a plethora of absorption lines with complex velocity structures (Fiore et al. 2005; Chen et al. 2007; Castro-Tirado et al. 2010), spanning thousands of km s^{-1} . Although a progenitor-star wind origin was claimed, this was firmly excluded (at least for some of these absorbing systems) by the detection of low-ionization transitions (see Chen et al. 2007). Here we focus only on the lowest velocity component, associated with the GRB sub-DLA, therefore likely representing the cold and warm ISM gas of the GRB host galaxy. Using the shift of the AlII $\lambda 1670$ and CII $\lambda 1334$ LIS from the systemic redshift of the galaxy, we determine a ISM velocity $V_{\text{LIS}} = -80 \pm 20 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. From the spectral flux distribution of the afterglow at several epochs, de Ugarte Postigo et al. (2005) determined an average $A_V = 0.20 \pm 0.08$ mag along the GRB line of sight.

3.3. GRB 060926

In the VLT/FORS1 image (Prog. ID: 079.A-0253(A); P.I.: P. Jakobsson) shown in Fig. 7, we see an offset between the GRB position and the brightest part of the system. Both are covered by the slit used for the host spectroscopic observations. In the X-shooter host galaxy observations obtained under program 085.A-0795(A) (presented here for the first time; P.I.: H. Flores; see Table 2), we identify the [OIII] $\lambda 5007$, [OII] $\lambda 3726$, H β and Ly α lines (see Fig. 8). These lines, except Ly α , are used to derive a redshift of $z = 3.2090 \pm 0.0001$ for the host galaxy which is consistent with the redshift derived in Krühler et al. (2015) with a different data set. Even with seeing conditions of $\sim 0''.8$, from the emission lines it is not possible to separate the different parts of the host galaxy systems. The spatial extension of the Ly α line in the 2D spectrum is $2''.7$, compared to $1''.4$ for the brightest nebular emission line [OIII] $\lambda 5007$.

Due to the high redshift of the host, the wavelength coverage of X-shooter does not allow us to observe the H α line. We determine a $\text{SFR} = 20.2 \pm 4.0 \text{ M}_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$, assuming $\text{H}\alpha = 2.86 \times \text{H}\beta$ (Osterbrock 1989). As we do not have any information on the host extinction, the value inferred above should be considered as a lower limit of the SFR. The Ly α emission from the host galaxy is an asymmetric line redshifted by $250 \pm 20 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ from the systemic redshift. The observed Ly α equivalent width and intrinsic properties are reported in Table 4.

The afterglow spectrum of GRB 060926 has been published in Fynbo et al. (2009). The Ly α line is clearly detected in the trough of the DLA. From the SiII $\lambda 1526$, AlII $\lambda 1670$ and CII $\lambda 1334$ LIS redshift, we determine a ISM velocity of $V_{\text{LIS}} = -30 \pm 180 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. The HI column density derived from the fit of the Ly α absorption (Fynbo et al. 2009) is among the highest values probed by GRB afterglow, $\log(N_{\text{HI}}/\text{cm}^{-2}) = 22.6 \pm 0.15$.

3.4. GRB 070110

The near-infrared X-shooter spectrum of GRB 070110 host galaxy has been studied in Krühler et al. (2015), but the

UVB spectrum has not been previously published. The [OIII] $\lambda \lambda 4959, 5007$, [OII] $\lambda 3726$, H α and Ly α lines are identified in the host galaxy spectrum (see Fig. 8), allowing a redshift determination of $z = 2.3523 \pm 0.0001$. The measured H α flux corresponds to a $\text{SFR} = 1.9 \pm 0.6 \text{ M}_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$. The Ly α emission from the host galaxy shows an asymmetric profile and is redshifted by $285 \pm 40 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ from the systemic redshift (see also Table 4 for other Ly α properties). The spatial extension of the Ly α line in the 2D spectrum is $2''.1$, compared to $2''.0$ for the brightest nebular emission line [OIII] $\lambda 5007$.

The afterglow spectrum of GRB 070110 has been published in Fynbo et al. (2009). They report the detection of the Ly α emission line in the trough of the GRB-DLA. From the SiII $\lambda 1526$, AlII $\lambda 1670$ and CII $\lambda 1334$ LIS redshift, we determine an ISM velocity $V_{\text{LIS}} = -20 \pm 50 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. The HI column density derived from the fit of the Ly α absorption (Fynbo et al. 2009) is $\log(N_{\text{HI}}/\text{cm}^{-2}) = 21.7 \pm 0.10$. Troja et al. (2007) determined $A_V = 0.08 \pm 0.08$ mag along the GRB afterglow line of sight.

4. Modelling of the Lyman-alpha line

4.1. Description of the model

Following Vielfaure et al. (2020), we model the observed Ly α line with the "shell-model" fitting pipeline described in Gronke et al. (2015). This simplistic model consists of an expanding, homogeneous, spherical shell composed of uniformly mixed neutral hydrogen and dust (Ahn et al. 2003; Verhamme et al. 2006). The expanding geometry was motivated by the HI outflows which seem to be ubiquitous at both low- and high-redshifts (e.g., Shapley et al. 2003; Wofford et al. 2013; Rivera-Thorsen et al. 2015; Chisholm et al. 2015). The Ly α emitting source is placed at the centre of the sphere filled with ionized gas and surrounded by a neutral and dusty shell. This source would correspond to the star-forming region hosting the LGRB. Such assumption is reasonable considering that LGRBs are produced by massive stars and are found in the central star-forming region of their host (typically at $\sim 1 \text{ kpc}$ from the center, Lyman et al. e.g., 2017). The photons are collected in all directions after their scattering through the neutral shell.

The shell model is defined by seven parameters that we briefly detail here. Four parameters describe the shell properties:

- the *radial expansion velocity* (V_{exp}). This parameter is physically linked to the broadening and the peak shift of the Ly α line. For outflowing shell, the velocity expansion regulates the blue peak intensity by scattering the photons in the red wing of the line. A higher velocity of the gas increases these effects but suppresses the interaction of the photons with the neutral gas. See for example Verhamme et al. (2006) for more details on this effect. The V_{exp} of the neutral gas can be linked to the velocity shift of the LIS lines (V_{LIS}) when available.
- The *HI column density* (N_{HI}). The effect of increasing N_{HI} is to broaden the line by shifting the Ly α photons from the line center.
- The *dust optical depth* (τ_d) at wavelengths in the vicinity of Ly α . The dust grains absorb and scatter the Ly α photons. An increasing dust content will favor this process and affect the intensity of the line but can also affect its shape. An increasing N_{HI} boosts the interaction of the photons with dust so both parameters are linked.
- The *effective temperature* of the gas (T). Its effect is complex and its impact on the width of the line and the position of the peak depends on the other parameter values.




Fig. 9. Best fit of the Ly α line obtained by the unconstrained shell model. For each LGRB host: in the top panels, the solid black line corresponds to the data with their error bars (grey), the dashed orange line is the best fit, and the dotted red line corresponds to the intrinsic Ly α emission predicted by the models; in the bottom panels the dots correspond to the normalized residuals between the observation and the model, and those in brown are the residuals covering the fitted Ly α line. The distribution of the residuals is projected in the right bottom panels. We also superimpose a Gaussian distribution with $\mu = 0$ and $\sigma = 1$ (dotted black line) as a reference for comparison. We test the deviation of the normalized residual distribution from this Gaussian distribution by using the Shapiro-Wilk test and we provide the p-value of the test in the bottom panels. A p-value above 0.05 indicates that it is no longer possible to reject the null hypothesis that the normalized residual distribution is drawn from a Gaussian distribution at a 95% confidence level.

Table 5. Best-fit results of the unconstrained shell model

GRB host	Shell model results from unconstrained fitting						
	Δz	$\log(N_{\text{HI}}/\text{cm}^{-2})$	V_{exp} [km s $^{-1}$]	$\log(T/\text{K})$	τ_d	$\text{FWHM}_i(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ [km s $^{-1}$]	$\text{EW}_i(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ [Å]
GRB 011211	30^{+45}_{-35}	$19.9^{+0.3}_{-0.1}$	112^{+33}_{-27}	$4.52^{+0.66}_{-1.08}$	$2.8^{+1.6}_{-1.7}$	440^{+130}_{-150}	63^{+38}_{-31}
GRB 021004	5^{+35}_{-35}	$19.6^{+0.1}_{-0.1}$	122^{+6}_{-6}	$4.99^{+0.13}_{-0.15}$	$0.365^{+0.104}_{-0.081}$	270^{+22}_{-24}	157^{+18}_{-13}
GRB 060926	0^{+45}_{-45}	$19.5^{+0.2}_{-0.1}$	164^{+35}_{-29}	$3.59^{+1.04}_{-0.57}$	$0.52^{+0.99}_{-0.40}$	890^{+115}_{-115}	63^{+35}_{-20}
GRB 070110	0^{+45}_{-45}	$19.7^{+0.3}_{-0.2}$	182^{+58}_{-45}	$4.37^{+0.94}_{-1.07}$	$1.14^{+2.00}_{-0.91}$	700^{+145}_{-160}	53^{+32}_{-25}

Notes. $\Delta z = (z_{\text{fit}} - z_{\text{host}}) \times c$, where z_{fit} is the Ly α redshift of the best fit, z_{host} is the redshift derived from the X-shooter emission lines (Table 6), and c is the speed of light; $\log(N_{\text{HI}}/\text{cm}^{-2})$ is the HI column density of the shell; V_{exp} is the shell expansion velocity; $\log(T/\text{K})$ is the temperature of the gas; τ_d is the dust optical depth; $\text{FWHM}_i(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ and $\text{EW}_i(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ are the intrinsic FWHM and equivalent width of the Ly α line, respectively.

We consider a Gaussian profile for the intrinsic Ly α emission and an adjacent flat UV continuum, therefore three additional parameters are used:

- the *redshift* of the emitter (z) corresponding to the center of the intrinsic Ly α line;
- the *intrinsic equivalent width* of the Ly α line ($\text{EW}_i(\text{Ly}\alpha)$);
- the *intrinsic FWHM* of the Ly α line ($\text{FWHM}_i(\text{Ly}\alpha)$).

We refer the reader to Verhamme et al. (2006) and Gronke et al. (2015) for a more detailed description on the model and parameters. The observation of LGRB host galaxy and after-

glow allows us to constrain these parameters even for faint star-forming galaxies. However, while host galaxy observations provide information for the overall galaxy, the afterglow constrains parameters along the LGRB line of sight. Therefore, by using the shell model with afterglow observations we assume that the LGRB region is the main source of Ly α emission in the host, and that the LGRB line of sight probes gas properties characteristic of the environment surrounding the LGRB region. In the following, to differentiate between the parameters constrained by these two types of observation, we annotate with X^{OA} the parameters related to optical afterglow observations and X^{HG} the host galaxy ones. As a first step, we fit the observed Ly α lines without con-

Table 6. Observationally determined values of the parameters of the shell model

GRB host	Redshift ^{HG}	$\log(N_{\text{HI}}^{\text{OA}}/\text{cm}^{-2})$	$V_{\text{LIS}}^{\text{OA}}$ [km s ⁻¹]	A_V^{OA} [mag]	τ_d^{OA}	$\text{FWHM}_i^{\text{HG}}(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ [km s ⁻¹]	$\text{EW}_i^{\text{HG}}(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ [Å]	Refs
GRB 011211	2.1434	20.4 ± 0.20	-160 ± 180	0.08 ± 0.08	0.52 ± 0.52	50^{+10*}_{-10}	< 64	(1)
GRB 021004	2.3298	19.5 ± 0.50	-80 ± 20	0.20 ± 0.08	1.29 ± 0.52	200^{+20}_{-20}	160 ± 40	(2)
GRB 060926	3.2090	22.6 ± 0.15	-30 ± 180	-	-	50^{+20}_{-20}	275 ± 85	(3)
GRB 070110	2.3523	21.7 ± 0.10	-20 ± 50	0.08 ± 0.08	0.52 ± 0.52	30^{+10}_{-30}	75 ± 35	(3)

Notes. We refer to Sect. 3 for the value determinations, except for the dust optical depth, τ_d , that is converted from A_V by considering a dust albedo of $A = 0.5$ (see Verhamme et al. 2006; Gronke et al. 2015). "*" is for value determined from the FWHM of the [OIII] λ 5007 line. "OA" is for the parameters related to optical afterglow observations and "HG" for the host galaxy ones.

References: The A_V values are reported in (1): Jakobsson et al. (2003); (2): de Ugarte Postigo et al. (2005); (3): Troja et al. (2007), see Sect. 3 for more details.

straints, as it would typically be done for the majority of high- z LAE observations, where most of the parameters can hardly be constrained observationally. Then, we fit the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ profiles using the observational constraints, discussing as well the effects of constraining the parameters with only the host galaxy or afterglow observations.

4.2. Unconstrained $\text{Ly}\alpha$ profile fitting

To evaluate the predictions of the shell model, we fit the observed $\text{Ly}\alpha$ lines of the four LGRBs of the *golden sample* using an improved model grid and process originally described in Gronke et al. (2015), without considering any prior. The automatic fitting succeeds in reproducing the line profile satisfactory in all four cases. In Fig. 9, we present for each spectrum the best fit corresponding to the lowest χ^2 . In all cases but GRB 011211 the models fit a blue peak which is not clearly seen in the spectra but consistent with the uncertainties. The distributions of normalized residuals presented at the bottom of each spectrum are consistent with a unit Gaussian distribution, indicating a good agreement between the models and the observations.

While the unconstrained shell model succeeds in reproducing the observed profiles, the comparison between the best shell parameters returned by the fitting (Table 5) and the corresponding values determined from the observations (Table 6) reveals important discrepancies for GRB 060926 and GRB 070110. Their observed HI column density is higher than the fit results, and the $\text{FWHM}_i(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ fitting values are largely overestimated.

The $\text{Ly}\alpha$ escape fraction ($f_{\text{esc}}(\text{Ly}\alpha)$; see Table 7) is also a by-product of the shell model and is found to be consistent (within the uncertainties) with the value determined from the observations (see Table 4) only in the case of GRB 070110. Particularly, $f_{\text{esc}}(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ is discrepant for GRB 011211 and 021004 whereas the fit and best-fitting parameters are in agreement with the observations. The disagreement on $f_{\text{esc}}(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ implies also that the $\text{H}\alpha$ flux and subsequent SFR obtained by the fit are inconsistent with the values determined from the observations (see Tables 3 and 7). For GRB 011211 the $\text{H}\alpha$ flux is less constrained (only 3σ upper limit) but a lower $\text{H}\alpha$ flux would imply an increased difference. We caution, however, that the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ escape fractions derived from the spectral fitting procedure is highly uncertain as it depends on the fitted value of τ_d which mostly has only minor effects on the spectral shape (see discussion in Gronke et al. 2015). The disagreement could also come from the lack of extinction correction of the observed $\text{H}\alpha$ flux in our calculation of $f_{\text{esc}}(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ and SFR (see Sect. 3). An $A_V \approx 0.6$ mag for both GRB 011211 and 021004 (considering an SMC extinction curve; Japelj et al. 2015) would result in consistent $\text{H}\alpha$ and $f_{\text{esc}}(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ values within 1σ .

Table 7. Properties derived from the best fit results (unconstrained model)

GRB host	Values obtained from the unconstrained fitting results			
	$f_{\text{esc}}(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ (1)	$F_i(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ (2)	$F(\text{H}\alpha)$ (3)	$\text{SFR}(\text{H}\alpha)$ (4)
011211	$0.03^{+0.07}_{-0.02}$	$53.1^{+124.5}_{-37.5}$	$6.1^{+14.3}_{-4.3}$	$10.1^{+24.0}_{-7.2}$
021004	$0.27^{+0.07}_{-0.05}$	$62.6^{+16.3}_{-11.6}$	$7.2^{+1.9}_{-1.4}$	$14.7^{+3.9}_{-2.9}$
060926	$0.69^{+0.19}_{-0.22}$	$7.8^{+7.5}_{-7.5}$	$0.9^{+0.4}_{-0.4}$	$3.9^{+1.8}_{-1.8}$
070110	$0.43^{+0.32}_{-0.24}$	$7.0^{+5.3}_{-4.4}$	$0.8^{+0.6}_{-0.5}$	$1.6^{+1.3}_{-1.1}$


Notes. Flux units are $10^{-17} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$. (1): Escape fraction of $\text{Ly}\alpha$ photons calculated by the models according to the method described in Gronke et al. (2015). (2): Intrinsic $\text{Ly}\alpha$ flux determined from the flux of the observed $\text{Ly}\alpha$ line and the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ escape fraction calculated by the models. (3): $\text{H}\alpha$ flux inferred from the flux of the observed $\text{Ly}\alpha$ line and the $f_{\text{esc}}(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ provided by the best fit results, calculated using $F(\text{H}\alpha) = F(\text{Ly}\alpha)/8.7$ (case B of the theory of the recombination (Brookelhurst 1971)). (4): SFR (in $M_\odot \text{ yr}^{-1}$) derived using the $\text{H}\alpha$ flux of column (3) and following the method described in Sect. 3.

4.3. Constrained $\text{Ly}\alpha$ profile fitting

We then proceeded to fit the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ using the observational constraints described in Sect. 3 and listed in Table 6, as priors. Using the afterglow and host galaxy spectra, as described in Sect. 3, we are able to constrain up to 6 out of the 7 parameters taken as input by the model. The host galaxy observations provide the information on the observed $\text{Ly}\alpha$ line and the Balmer lines used to constrain the intrinsic $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emission ($\text{FWHM}_i^{\text{HG}}(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ and $\text{EW}_i^{\text{HG}}(\text{Ly}\alpha)$). They also provide the nebular emission lines used to constrain the redshift (z^{HG}). The afterglow observations constrain the gas properties: the hydrogen column density ($N_{\text{HI}}^{\text{OA}}$), the velocity of the gas ($V_{\text{LIS}}^{\text{OA}}$) and the information on the dust content (τ_d^{OA}). It was not possible to constrain the HI temperature. The effect of this parameter on the final profile is complex and usually it is degenerated with the other parameters (Gronke et al. 2015). We let this parameter free for the 4 cases. For GRB 060926 we lack information about the dust extinction, and for GRB 011211 we have only upper limits for $\text{H}\alpha$. To be consistent with the constraints on the $N_{\text{HI}}^{\text{OA}}$ values derived from the afterglow, the dust extinctions are taken from the afterglow SED fitting reported in Sect. 3. The grid we use does not extend up to $\log(N_{\text{HI}}/\text{cm}^{-2}) = 22.6$, so this value is not firmly constrained for GRB 060926 but constrained to the highest value of the grid which is 21.8. We report the results of the fitting in Table 8. In Fig. 10, the intrinsic $\text{Ly}\alpha$ derived from the model and the best fit obtained with the lowest χ^2 are superimposed to the data.

Table 8. Results of the shell model fit with constrained parameters

GRB host	Shell model results from constrained fitting						
	Δz	$\log(N_{\text{HI}}/\text{cm}^{-2})$	V_{exp} [km s $^{-1}$]	$\log(T/\text{K})$	τ_d	$\text{FWHM}_i(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ [km s $^{-1}$]	$\text{EW}_i(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ [Å]
GRB 011211	20^{+45}_{-45}	$20.1^{+0.2}_{-0.1}$	74^{+27}_{-24}	$3.91^{+0.8}_{-0.75}$	$0.50^{+0.29}_{-0.24}$	30^{+50}_{-20}	45^{+14}_{-18}
GRB 021004	5^{+45}_{-45}	$19.6^{+0.1}_{-0.1}$	118^{+5}_{-6}	$4.99^{+0.16}_{-0.15}$	$0.402^{+0.103}_{-0.093}$	227^{+11}_{-12}	161^{+13}_{-9}
GRB 060926	70^{+45}_{-45}	$21.5^{+0.1}_{-0.1}$	3^{+1}_{-1}	$2.94^{+0.16}_{-0.11}$	$0.003^{+0.004}_{-0.002}$	70^{+20}_{-20}	23^{+9}_{-6}
GRB 070110	35^{+45}_{-45}	$21.5^{+0.1}_{-0.1}$	3^{+1}_{-1}	$3.04^{+0.12}_{-0.12}$	$0.008^{+0.010}_{-0.005}$	53^{+20}_{-20}	33^{+25}_{-13}

Notes. Same as Table 5 for models constrained with z , N_{HI} , V_{exp} , τ_d , $\text{FWHM}_i(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ and $\text{EW}_i(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ **Fig. 10.** Same as Fig. 9 but with the shell model parameters z , N_{HI} , V_{exp} , τ_d , $\text{FWHM}_i(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ and $\text{EW}_i(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ constrained by the values determined from the observations.

Not surprisingly, we find a good agreement between the fitting and the observations of the two hosts with lower $N_{\text{HI}}^{\text{OA}}$ (GRB 011211 and 021004). As shown by the residuals at the bottom of Fig. 10, the fit is worse than in the unconstrained case for GRB 070110 and fails to reproduce the Ly α profile and parameters for GRB 060926, which has an extreme $\log(N_{\text{HI}}^{\text{OA}}/\text{cm}^{-2})$ value of 22.6. In these two cases the models tend to fit a double peak profile with higher red peak velocity shift ($\sim 400 \text{ km s}^{-1}$) than observed ($\sim 280 \text{ km s}^{-1}$) and quasi-static HI shell ($3 \pm 1 \text{ km s}^{-1}$) which results in a double peak profile. By relaxing the constraints, without considering priors for $\text{FWHM}_i(\text{Ly}\alpha)^{\text{HG}}$, we manage to fit the profile of GRB 070110 in a better way but

the best-fitting $\text{FWHM}_i(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ becomes extremely narrow with an unrealistic value of $8^{+6}_{-3} \text{ km s}^{-1}$.

We also performed two sets of fitting constraining separately the parameter values determined from the host galaxy and the afterglow observations. We find that the profiles of the fitting constrained with the host galaxy observations (z^{HG} , $\text{FWHM}_i^{\text{HG}}(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ and $\text{EW}_i^{\text{HG}}(\text{Ly}\alpha)$) are very similar to the unconstrained cases, well reproducing the data (see Appendix C). Differently from the unconstrained case, the blue peak is not present, which is due to the constraint on $\text{FWHM}_i^{\text{HG}}(\text{Ly}\alpha)$. The predictions for the properties of the gas are also similar to the unconstrained cases. Especially, the N_{HI} values are lower than observed through LGRB line of sight. The fitting constrained with the afterglow observa-

tions (z^{HG} , $N_{\text{HI}}^{\text{OA}}$, $V_{\text{LIS}}^{\text{OA}}$ and τ_d^{OA}) only gives very similar results to the fully constrained case (see Appendix D). The models successfully reproduce the low N_{HI} cases but fail to reproduce the two cases with high $N_{\text{HI}}^{\text{OA}}$ values.

These results are in agreement with previous finding that the most constraining parameters are N_{HI} and V_{exp} (e.g., Gronke et al. 2015).

5. Discussion

5.1. Implications of the shell-model fits

The unconstrained fitting succeeds in reproducing all Ly α profiles of the *golden sample* (and GRB 191004B; see Vielfaure et al. 2020). However, if we compare the parameter values resulting from the fitting with those observed, we find that for GRB 060926 and GRB 070110 there are important discrepancies. A fit performed constraining the parameters values with the observed ones does not succeed in reproducing the observed line profile of these two cases.

The $\text{FWHM}_i(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ provided by the unconstrained models for GRB 060926 and 070110 are very large and disagree with the $\text{FWHM}_i(\text{Ly}\alpha)^{\text{HG}}$ we determined assuming that the Balmer photons and Ly α photons are produced by recombination in the same regions. Such high values are usually returned by the shell model fitting to reproduce the line profile of the emitters having Ly α peaks and wings substantially shifted from the systemic redshift. A similar discrepancy has also been found by Hashimoto et al. (2015) in the study of $z \sim 2$ LAEs and in the Yang et al. (2016) and Orlitová et al. (2018) studies on low-redshift GP galaxies. The latter also reports a discrepancy between the systemic redshift derived from the models and the observed ones, whereas they agree in our case. Hashimoto et al. (2015) propose that other sources of Ly α emission than star formation, such as gravitational cooling, could account for the large intrinsic width of the Ly α emission line. Orlitová et al. (2018) try to explain the FWHM discrepancy considering complex kinematic structures (as testified by broad H α and H β wings observed in their GP spectra) but with negative results. They conclude that the discrepancy is a model failure and not a physical effect. From our data we cannot recover possible kinematic structures. A likely cause for the mismatch is a widening of the "intrinsic" Ly α spectrum due to radiative transfer effects (as discussed, e.g., in Yang et al. 2016). In fact, the study of Gronke et al. (2018) supports such a scenario (also see the recent study by Li et al. 2020, where $\gg 100 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ observed spectra were modeled with narrow intrinsic spectra). There, the authors post-process a hydrodynamic simulation of a galactic disk using Ly α radiative transfer, and show that the spectrum is indeed widened compared to H α due to ISM turbulence (cf. their figure 1 where the intrinsic spectrum of width $\sim 100 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ is widened to $\sim 400 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ due to radiative transfer effects within the gaseous disk)⁷. This could in principle explain the effect seen here where the intrinsic width obtained from the shell-model fitting is much wider than the one inferred from the observations.

Another important discrepant value is N_{HI} . The fit returns lower values than those determined from the afterglow spectroscopy in half of our sample. The two GRBs of the discrepant

cases have much higher $N_{\text{HI}}^{\text{OA}}$ than the other GRBs in the *golden sample*, with $\log(N_{\text{HI}}^{\text{OA}}/\text{cm}^{-2}) > 21.5$ as opposed to values of $\log(N_{\text{HI}}^{\text{OA}}/\text{cm}^{-2}) \sim 20$. The Ly α emission corresponds to a resonant transition making its escape unfavorable when the photons pass through a static high- N_{HI} density medium. In the shell model, N_{HI} impacts the Ly α peak shift, with low N_{HI} values corresponding to small shifts and vice-versa. Indeed, when we constrain its value, the model is not able to reproduce the line profile for GRB 060926 and 070110, and results in a peak shifted to larger velocities ($\sim 400 \text{ km s}^{-1}$).

When considering all the LGRBs with a measured $N_{\text{HI}}^{\text{OA}}$ (reported in Tanvir et al. 2019), we see (Fig. 11) that such high $N_{\text{HI}}^{\text{OA}}$ values are common among LAE-LGRBs. Even if the fraction of LAE-LGRBs from sub-DLA/Lyman-limit systems ($\log(N_{\text{HI}}^{\text{OA}}/\text{cm}^{-2}) < 20.3$; $22\% \pm 11\%$) seems to be higher (considering also the poor statistics) than that from DLA ($\log(N_{\text{HI}}^{\text{OA}}/\text{cm}^{-2}) > 20.3$; $15\% \pm 4\%$), there is no strong evidence for Ly α suppression associated with high $N_{\text{HI}}^{\text{OA}}$. Also, the Ly α luminosity seems not to depend on $N_{\text{HI}}^{\text{OA}}$ (see Fig. 11, right panel).

The discrepancy among the observed $N_{\text{HI}}^{\text{OA}}$ values and those found by the fitting, as well as the high $N_{\text{HI}}^{\text{OA}}$ values found among LAE-LGRBs, could be explained by the difference between the medium probed by Ly α photons and the afterglow emission. LGRB lines of sight may go through regions with high $N_{\text{HI}}^{\text{OA}}$, while Ly α photons may have escaped through lower N_{HI} lines of sight from the GRB young star-forming region. This would imply an anisotropic environment. The theoretical studies of resonant line transfer through simplified anisotropic geometries (e.g., Dijkstra & Kramer 2012; Behrens et al. 2014; Eide et al. 2018) as well as turbulent medium with ionized channels (e.g., Kimm et al. 2019; Kakiichi & Gronke 2019) show that Ly α spectra are shaped by the lowest density pathways. This predicts that in general, the column density probed by Ly α is less or equal to the one observed along the line of sight, in agreement to what we find for the LAE-LGRB modelling presented here. To put constraints on the H I anisotropy is important also to the consequences this can have on the ionizing escape fraction of galaxies (e.g., Vielfaure et al. 2020). Already from this work where we find $\log(N_{\text{HI}}^{\text{OA}}(\text{LGRB})/N_{\text{HI}}(\text{Ly}\alpha)) \sim 2-3$ in two of the cases, we can speculate that it is difficult to explain this large anisotropy by purely turbulent driving. For reasonable Mach numbers $\mathcal{M} \lesssim 5$ studies show only ~ 1 dex difference (for $\sim 10\%$ of the sight-lines; Safarzadeh & Scannapieco 2016) which suggests the need of radiative or mechanical feedback causing larger anisotropies (Kimm et al. 2019; Kakiichi & Gronke 2019; Cen 2020).

The study of LGRB lines of sight shows that, from a statistical point of view, low-density channels surrounding star-forming regions should be rare (Tanvir et al. 2019). This is consistent with LGRB progenitors being massive stars typically formed in dense molecular clouds and residing in gas-rich star-forming galaxies (e.g., Jakobsson et al. 2006). The observation of the time-variability of fine-structure transitions, in LGRB afterglow spectra, has shown that the distance of the dominant absorbing clouds ranges from $\sim 50 \text{ pc}$ to 1 kpc (e.g., Vreeswijk et al. 2013). The neutral gas probed by LGRB afterglows should therefore be connected to the star-forming regions where LGRBs explode. Since these regions are also expected to be the main birthplaces of Ly α photons, the properties of LGRB lines of sight could represent the average conditions of the environment surrounding Ly α emission regions. If we consider the proportion of sub-DLA LGRBs as representative on average of the low-density channels through which the gas has favourable conditions for the Ly α ra-

⁷ In Gronke et al. (2018), the subsequent effect of the "shell" can be taken quite literally as they consider cosmic-ray driven outflows which are likely smooth and cold (e.g., Girichidis et al. 2018) – like a shell. However, in general this can also be due to CGM effects, or, a lack of numerical resolution leading to a "shell" by smoothing out otherwise multiphase structure (Gronke et al. 2018).




Fig. 11. *Left Panel:* N_{HI} distribution of the 140 LGRBs reported in Tanvir et al. (2019) (grey). The 22/29 LAE-LGRBs having this information are shown in light blue, except for the GRB in the *golden sample* that are represented in dark blue. The different histograms are superimposed and not cumulative. *Right Panel:* $\text{Ly}\alpha$ luminosity distribution as function of N_{HI} column density. The symbols are the same as in Fig. 1.

diation to escape, they would correspond to 12% of all the possible lines of sight⁸.

Even if LGRBs sites pinpoint regions with high star-formation activity (and therefore a significant production of $\text{Ly}\alpha$ photons), another possibility to explain the N_{HI} discrepancy is that most of the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ photons that succeed to escape from the galaxy may not originate from the young star-forming regions probed by GRBs (as also proposed by Vreeswijk et al. 2004 for GRB 030323). One way to investigate both scenarios would be through galaxy simulations, studying the global, the line of sight and the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emission properties and comparing them to those determined by LGRB afterglow and host observations. This is beyond the scope of this paper and will be the object of a further paper.

The situation is even more complex if we look at the morphological properties of the host galaxies in more detail. The images of the host galaxies reveal a patchy and irregular morphology (see Fig. 7). The HST images obtained for GRB 021004 (Fynbo et al. 2005) shows that the GRB position is superimposed to the strongest UV emitting region. This is not the case for GRB 011211 (Fynbo et al. 2003), where the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emission envelops the entire galaxy but the peak of emission is clearly separated from the GRB position. Interestingly, this does not prevent the match between the shell model and the observations. A complex morphology is also found for other LAE-LGRB hosts (GRB 000926 Fynbo et al. 2002, GRB 050315 and GRB 061222A Blanchard et al. 2016). Such irregular and clumpy systems may represent mergers (e.g., Conselice et al. 2003) or just clumps of star formation. The presence of a companion galaxy ~ 15 kpc away from the GRB 021004 host, and the high velocity absorption found in its afterglow spectra, may suggest interaction of the two galaxies and the presence of outflowing gas. In this light, the success of a very simple configuration as the one of the shell model in reproducing the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ profile and the observed parameters is maybe surprising.

⁸ Interestingly, previous studies of anisotropic $\text{Ly}\alpha$ escape show that such low opening angles can in principle be sufficient to set the properties of the isotropically emergent spectrum (Dijkstra et al. 2016; Eide et al. 2018; Kakiichi et al. 2018).

5.2. Comparison to LyC leakers

In Fig. 12, we compare properties of LAE-LGRBs to those of known LyC leakers in the literature. For this comparison, we consider the LyC leakers at $z \sim 3.1$ reported by Fletcher et al. (2019) and *Ion2* ($z \sim 3.2$, de Barros et al. 2016; Vanzella et al. 2016). We also consider those detected in the local Universe analysed in Verhamme et al. (2017) as well as the green peas studied in Izotov et al. (2018a,b). The properties compared are the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ escape fraction, the rest-frame $\text{Ly}\alpha$ equivalent width, the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ red peak velocity (v_{peak}) and also the $[\text{OIII}]/[\text{OII}]$ ratio (O_{32}). The last three properties have been proposed in the literature to correlate with ionizing and $\text{Ly}\alpha$ photons leakage. Verhamme et al. (2017) have pointed out rest-frame $\text{EW}(\text{Ly}\alpha) > 70$ Å, $f_{\text{esc}}(\text{Ly}\alpha) > 0.3$, $v_{\text{peak}} < 150$ km s⁻¹ and $\text{O}_{32} > 4$ as good indirect indicators of high LyC leakage ($f_{\text{esc}}(\text{LyC}) > 5\%$). The O_{32} ratio is a proxy of the ionization state of the gas in the star forming regions and has been proposed as a marker of density-bounded HII regions (Jaskot & Oey 2014; Nakajima et al. 2013; Nakajima & Ouchi 2014; Stasińska et al. 2015). Its positive correlation with the escape fraction of ionizing and $\text{Ly}\alpha$ photons leakage have been shown in several studies for local GPs or high-redshift LAEs (e.g., Nakajima & Ouchi 2014; Izotov et al. 2016, 2018a,b; de Barros et al. 2016; Verhamme et al. 2017; Fletcher et al. 2019).

From the comparisons we see that, except for GRB 060707 and GRB 060605 that show very high v_{peak} , the LAE-LGRBs fall in the same parameter space as LyC leakers and follow the correlations between the indirect indicators found by Verhamme et al. (2017). Following the study of Verhamme et al. (2017) on low-redshift LyC leakers, we can cut these plots in two regions corresponding to strong LyC leakers ($f_{\text{esc}}(\text{LyC}) > 5\%$, red rectangle) and weak LyC leakers ($f_{\text{esc}}(\text{LyC}) < 5\%$, blue rectangle). All LAE-LGRBs fall in the category of the weak LyC leakers except GRB 021004 which appears systematically in good agreement with the region of the strong leakers. In panel (b) of Fig. 12, we also superimposed the distribution of $[\text{OIII}]/[\text{OII}]$ ratio for the GRB sample of Krühler et al. (2015) and GRB 081121 reported here. We see that for the majority of the GRBs this ratio is around two, with seven cases at $\text{O}_{32} > 4$. GRB 021004 has a high value of $\text{O}_{32} > 10$ and is the strongest LAE of our




Fig. 12. Comparison of the properties of the four LAE-LGRBs from the *golden sample* (orange stars) to other LAE-LGRBs and Lyman continuum emitters (LCEs) reported in Verhamme et al. (2017), Izotov et al. (2018a,b) and Fletcher et al. (2019). The white stars with orange contours represent LAE-LGRBs for which information on indirect indicators is available. The colorbar codes the $f_{\text{esc}}(\text{LyC})$ of the LCEs. In the four panels the blue rectangle represents the space parameter of low LyC leakage ($f_{\text{esc}}(\text{LyC}) < 5\%$) while the red rectangle marks the space parameter of high LyC leakage ($f_{\text{esc}}(\text{LyC}) > 5\%$) as defined by Verhamme et al. (2017). Panel (a) shows the escape fraction of Ly α photons as a function of the rest-frame Ly α EW. Panel (b) shows the correlation between the rest-frame Ly α EW and the [OIII]/[OII] ratio. The distribution of [OIII]/[OII] ratio for the LGRB host galaxies from Krühler et al. (2015) is also superimposed. Panel (c) shows the relation between the Ly α red peak velocity shift and the rest-frame Ly α EW. Panel (d) shows the correlation between the Ly α red peak velocity shift and the [OIII]/[OII] ratio.

golden sample with a substantial $f_{\text{esc}}(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ of 60%, in agreement with potentially high $f_{\text{esc}}(\text{LyC})$. Nevertheless, the Ly α profile of GRB 021004 is a single peak with no residual flux at the Ly α line center. This is not the typical line shape observed for confirmed LyC emitters which have the tendency to show double- or triple-peak profile (Verhamme et al. 2017; Rivera-Thorsen et al. 2017; Vanzella et al. 2020). Also our shell-model fitting suggests the column densities to be too large to allow LyC photons to escape. However, this model already predicted similar HI column density ($\log(N_{\text{HI}}/\text{cm}^{-2}) \approx 19 - 20$) for four Green Pea galaxies out of the five with detected LyC emission reported in Yang et al. (2017), suggesting that LyC emission can escape through holes in the ISM even if the Ly α photons probe denser neutral gas. The only LAE-LGRB for which LyC leakage has been detected along the LGRB line of sight ($f_{\text{esc}}(\text{LyC}) = 0.35^{+0.10}_{-0.11}$) is GRB 191004B (Vielvaure et al. 2020). However, in Fig. 12 (panel (c)) we can see that it does not fall in the high escape fraction region but in the lower left area. The reasons could be that (i) $f_{\text{esc}}(\text{LyC})$ is lower at the scale of the galaxy than along the LGRB line of sight, and (ii) the indicators of strong LyC leakage evolves with redshift. As a comparison, the LyC emitters from Fletcher et al. (2019) are found out of the high escape region (red rectangle). They show lower rest-frame EW(Ly α) and higher v_{peak} than the local LyC emitters whereas their escape fraction of ionising photons is significantly higher ($f_{\text{esc}}(\text{LyC}) = 15 - 60\%$). This could also suggest that strong LyC leakers span a wider parameters space

than predicted by the study of local LyC emitters. Overall it is clear that this kind of studies are still limited by the poor statistic and the current results show the difficulty of characterizing LyC leakage based only on these properties.

6. Conclusions

In this paper we have studied the Ly α emission of LGRB host galaxies. First, we provide a new census of LAEs among LGRB host galaxies. To date, there are 29 LAE-LGRBs. The fraction of LAEs among LGRB hosts varies from $\sim 10\%$ to 40% depending on the sample and threshold considered. Such statistics are lower than those found for LBG samples at similar redshift range, but they become comparable when taking into account only LAEs with rest-frame EW(Ly α) $> 20 \text{ \AA}$. These results can be explained by the different selection criteria of the parent samples and by the shallower spectral observations of LGRB samples compared to LBG ones. We compared the properties of LAE-LGRBs to those of LGRB hosts in general and find evidences of Ly α emission suppression in dusty hosts. We showed that, since LGRB hosts are not selected following usual criteria and techniques used for Ly α emission searches in star forming galaxies, they probe the regime of Ly α emission of the bulk of the UV-selected galaxy population at intermediate (and possibly high) redshifts.

We then selected a sub-sample of four LGRBs that allowed the combination of the emission properties of the host galaxies

with the information on the ISM probed by the afterglow. We fit the Ly α emission of these galaxies using the shell model and we use the ancillary observational properties to constrain and test the model. We find that, without priors on the parameters, the shell model succeeds in reproducing the four profiles. However, the properties predicted by the model differ from the observed ones for the two cases (GRB 060926 and 070110) having a high $N_{\text{HI}}^{\text{OA}}$. Similarly, constraining the model parameters using the values determined from the observations, the shell model succeeds in reproducing the two lower $N_{\text{HI}}^{\text{OA}}$ cases but fails for the two highest $N_{\text{HI}}^{\text{OA}}$ ones. These results may be due to the fact that (i) the N_{HI} of the gas probed by the LGRB afterglow ($N_{\text{HI}}^{\text{OA}}(\text{LGRB})$) is not representative of that encountered by the Ly α photons ($N_{\text{HI}}(\text{Ly}\alpha)$); specifically we find $N_{\text{HI}}(\text{Ly}\alpha) \leq N_{\text{HI}}^{\text{OA}}(\text{LGRB})$, consistent with the picture that Ly α photons escape preferentially through low-column density channels and (ii) as known, the shell model relies on a too simplistic gas configuration. A consistent scenario would be provided by a turbulent medium widening the intrinsic Ly α spectrum, and an anisotropic HI distribution allowing the escape of Ly α photons through lower density channels than probed by the LGRB sightline. Such a description is consistent with mechanical and radiative feedback mechanisms produced by starburst and supernova that clear out channels from the active regions within the galaxies. Nevertheless, we stress that the afterglows of most LGRBs and LAE-LGRBs show $\log(N_{\text{HI}}^{\text{OA}}/\text{cm}^{-2}) > 20.3$, implying that likely the Ly α photons produced by massive stars will predominantly be surrounded by such high-density gas, and low-density channels should be rare ($\sim 10\%$). Another possibility is that, even if dense star-forming regions produce a high fraction of Ly α photons, most of Ly α escaping photons come from less dense regions overall the galaxy. We will investigate further both scenarios in the future taking advantage of galaxy simulations.

Finally, we compared the properties of the LAE-LGRBs with those of LyC leakers in the literature. Specifically, we considered the commonly used Ly α indirect indicators of LyC leakage at low redshift and find that only one LAE-LGRB (GRB 021004) has the corresponding values for being a strong LyC leaker. However (strong) LyC reported in the literature at $z \sim 3$, span a wider range of parameter values than those commonly considered to point towards strong LyC leakage, questioning the use of such indicators at least at high redshift.

The analysis presented in this paper needs larger statistics. To this purpose, we have been awarded X-shooter time to observe eleven more LAE-LGRBs reported in the census. In the future it will be possible to extend these studies to higher redshift. Indeed, new space GRB missions like *Gamow Explorer* (White 2020) and *THESEUS*⁹ (Amati et al. 2018; pre-selected as M5 European Space Agency mission), in synergy with ELT and JWST observations, will enable us to perform similar studies at $z > 3.5$, and with better statistics.

Acknowledgements. We thanks A. Verhamme for very useful discussions. This work is part of the *BEaPro* project (P.I.: S.D. Vergani) funded by the French *Agence Nationale de la Recherche* (ANR-16-CE31-0003) and supporting JBV PhD thesis. JBV is now supported by LabEx UnivEarthS (ANR-10-LABX-0023 and ANR-18-IDEX-0001). MG is supported by NASA through the NASA Hubble Fellowship grant HST-HF2-51409 and acknowledges support from HST grants HST-GO-15643.017-A, HST-AR-15039.003-A, and XSEDE grant TG-AST180036. The Cosmic Dawn Center is funded by the Danish National Research Foundation under grant no. 140. BMJ is supported in part by Independent Research Fund Denmark grant DFF - 7014-00017. Based on observations collected at the European Southern Observatory under ESO programmes: 079.A-0253, 084.A-0631, 084.A-0260, 084.A-0303, 084.D-0265, 085.A-0009, 086.A-0073, 086.B-0954, 086.A-0533, 086.A-0874, 087.A-0055, 087.A-0451,

087.B-0737, 088.A-0051, 088.A-0644, 089.A-0067, 089.A-0120, 089.D-0256, 089.A-0868, 090.A-0088, 090.A-0760, 090.A-0825, 091.A-0342, 091.A-0703, 091.A-0877, 091.C-0934, 0091.C-0934, 092.D-0056, 092.D-0633, 092.A-0076, 092.A-0124, 092.A-0231, 093.A-0069, 094.A-0593, 094.A-0134, 095.A-0045, 095.B-0811, 096.A-0079, 097.A-0036, 097.D-0672, 098.D-0416, 098.A-0136, and 098.A-0055.

References

- Ahn, S.-H. 2000, *ApJ*, 530, L9
Ahn, S.-H. 2004, *ApJ*, 601, L25
Ahn, S.-H., Lee, H.-W., & Lee, H. M. 2003, *MNRAS*, 340, 863
Amati, L., O’Brien, P., Götz, D., et al. 2018, *Advances in Space Research*, 62, 191
Appenzeller, I., Fricke, K., Fürtig, W., et al. 1998, *The Messenger*, 94, 1
Arabsalmani, M., Le Floch, E., Dannerbauer, H., et al. 2018, *MNRAS*, 476, 2332
Bagley, M. B., Scarlata, C., Henry, A., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 837, 11
Behrens, C., Dijkstra, M., & Niemeyer, J. C. 2014, *A&A*, 563, A77
Berger, E. & Rauch, M. 2008, *GCN*, 8542, 1
Blanchard, P. K., Berger, E., & Fong, W. 2016, *ApJ*, 817, 144
Bolmer, J., Ledoux, C., Wiseman, P., et al. 2019, *A&A*, 623, A43
Brocklehurst, M. 1971, *MNRAS*, 153, 471
Castro-Tirado, A. J., Møller, P., García-Segura, G., et al. 2010, *A&A*, 517, A61
Cen, R. 2020, *ApJ*, 889, L22
Chabrier, G. 2003, *PASP*, 115, 763
Chen, H., Prochaska, J. X., Ramirez-Ruiz, E., et al. 2007, *ApJ*, 663, 420
Chen, H.-W. 2012, *MNRAS*, 419, 3039
Chisholm, J., Tremonti, C. A., Leitherer, C., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 811, 149
Conselice, C. J., Bershad, M. A., Dickinson, M., & Papovich, C. 2003, *AJ*, 126, 1183–1207
Cucchiara, A., Fumagalli, M., Rafelski, M., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 804, 51
de Barros, S., Vanzella, E., Amorin, R., et al. 2016, *A&A*, 585, A51
de Ugarte Postigo, Castro-Tirado, A. J., Gorosabel, J., et al. 2005, *A&A*, 443, 841
D’Elia, V., Fynbo, J. P. U., Izzo, L., et al. 2019, *GCN*, 25956, 1
Dessauges-Zavadsky, M., D’Odorico, S., Schaerer, D., et al. 2010, *A&A*, 510, A26
Dijkstra, M., Gronke, M., & Sobral, D. 2016, *ApJ*, 823, 74
Dijkstra, M. & Kramer, R. 2012, *MNRAS*, 424, 1672
D’Avanzo, P., Perri, M., Fugazza, D., et al. 2010, *A&A*, 522, A20
Eide, M. B., Gronke, M., Dijkstra, M., & Hayes, M. 2018, *ApJ*, 856, 156
Elíasdóttir, Á., Fynbo, J. P. U., Hjorth, J., et al. 2009, *ApJ*, 697, 1725
Erb, D. K., Steidel, C. C., Trainor, R. F., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 795, 33
Fiore, F., D’Elia, V., Lazzati, D., et al. 2005, *ApJ*, 624, 853
Fletcher, T. J., Tang, M., Robertson, B. E., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 878, 87
Fox, D. W. 2002, *GCN*, 1564, 1
Friis, M., De Cia, A., Krühler, T., et al. 2015, *MNRAS*, 451, 167
Fynbo, J. P. U., Gorosabel, J., Smette, A., et al. 2005, *ApJ*, 633, 317
Fynbo, J. P. U., Jakobsson, P., Møller, P., et al. 2003, *A&A*, 406, L63
Fynbo, J. P. U., Jakobsson, P., Prochaska, J. X., et al. 2009, *ApJ*, 185, 526
Fynbo, J. P. U., Møller, P., Thomsen, B., et al. 2002, *A&A*, 388, 425
Fynbo, J. U., Møller, P., & Warren, S. J. 1999, *MNRAS*, 305, 849
Gehrels, N. & Razzaque, S. 2013, *Front. Phys.*, 8, 661
Girichidis, P., Naab, T., Hanaas, M., & Walch, S. 2018, *MNRAS*, 479, 3042
Graham, J. F. & Fruchter, A. S. 2017, *ApJ*, 834, 170
Gronke, M. 2017, *A&A*, 608, A139
Gronke, M., Bull, P., & Dijkstra, M. 2015, *ApJ*, 812, 123
Gronke, M., Girichidis, P., Naab, T., & Walch, S. 2018, *ApJ*, 862, L7
Hartoog, O. E., Malesani, D., Fynbo, J. P. U., et al. 2015, *A&A*, 580, A139
Hashimoto, T., Verhamme, A., Ouchi, M., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 812, 157
Heintz, K. E., Ledoux, C., Fynbo, J. P. U., et al. 2019, *A&A*, 621, A20
Henry, A., Scarlata, C., Martin, C. L., & Erb, D. 2015, *ApJ*, 809, 19
Hjorth, J., Malesani, D., Jakobsson, P., et al. 2012, *ApJ*, 756, 187
Hjorth, J., Sollerman, J., Møller, P., et al. 2003, *Nature*, 423, 847
Holland, S. T., Barthelmy, S. D., Burrows, D. N., et al. 2006, *GCN*, 5612, 1
Izotov, Y. I., Schaerer, D., Thuan, T. X., et al. 2016, *MNRAS*, 461, 3683
Izotov, Y. I., Schaerer, D., Worseck, G., et al. 2018a, *MNRAS*, 474, 4514
Izotov, Y. I., Worseck, G., Schaerer, D., et al. 2018b, *MNRAS*, 478, 4851
Jakobsson, P., Björnsson, G., Fynbo, J. P. U., et al. 2005, *MNRAS*, 362, 245
Jakobsson, P., Fynbo, J. P. U., Ledoux, C., et al. 2006, *A&A*, 460, L13
Jakobsson, P., Hjorth, J., Fynbo, J. P. U., et al. 2003, *A&A*, 408, 941
Jakobsson, P., Hjorth, J., Fynbo, J. P. U., et al. 2004, *A&A*, 427, 785
Jakobsson, P., Hjorth, J., Malesani, D., et al. 2012, *ApJ*, 752, 62
Japelj, J., Covino, S., Gomboc, A., et al. 2015, *A&A*, 579, A74
Japelj, J., Vergani, S. D., Salvaterra, R., et al. 2016, *A&A*, 590, A129
Jaskot, A. E. & Oey, M. S. 2014, *ApJ*, 791, L19
Kakiichi, K., Ellis, R. S., Laporte, N., et al. 2018, *MNRAS*, 479, 43

⁹ <https://www.isdc.unige.ch/theseus/>

- Kakiichi, K. & Gronke, M. 2019, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:1905.02480
- Kennicutt, Robert C., J. 1998, ARA&A, 36, 189
- Kimm, T., Blaizot, J., Garel, T., et al. 2019, MNRAS, 486, 2215
- Kruehler, T. & Schady, P. 2017, Figshare, <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.-4776886.v3>
- Krühler, T., Malesani, D., Fynbo, J. P. U., et al. 2015, A&A, 581, A125
- Krühler, T., Malesani, D., Milvang-Jensen, B., et al. 2012, ApJ, 758, 46
- Kulkarni, S. R., Djorgovski, S. G., Ramaprakash, A. N., et al. 1998, Nature, 393, 35
- Kunth, D., Mas-Hesse, J. M., Terlevich, E., et al. 1998, A&A, 334, 11
- Laursen, P., Sommer-Larsen, J., & Andersen, A. C. 2009, ApJ, 704, 1640
- Leclercq, F., Bacon, R., Wisotzki, L., et al. 2017, A&A, 608, A8
- Li, Z., Steidel, C. C., Gronke, M., & Chen, Y. 2020, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2008.09130
- Lidman, C., Hayes, M., Jones, D. H., et al. 2012, MNRAS, 420, 1946
- Lyman, J. D., Levan, A. J., Tanvir, N. R., et al. 2017, MNRAS, 467, 1795
- Malesani, D., Jaunsen, A. O., & Vreeswijk, P. M. 2007, GCN, 6015, 1
- Malesani, D., Xu, D., Fynbo, J. P. U., et al. 2013, GCN, 14291, 1
- Matthee, J., Sobral, D., Hayes, M., et al. 2021, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2102.07779
- Matthee, J., Sobral, D., Oteo, I., et al. 2016, MNRAS, 458, 449
- Milvang-Jensen, B., Fynbo, J. P. U., Malesani, D., et al. 2012, ApJ, 756, 25
- Mirabal, N., Halpern, J. P., Chornock, R., et al. 2003, 595, 15
- Modigliani, A., Goldoni, P., Royer, F., et al. 2010, SPIE Conference Series, Vol. 7737, The X-shooter pipeline, 773728
- Møller, P., Fynbo, J. P. U., Hjorth, J., et al. 2002, A&A, 396, L21
- Nakajima, K. & Ouchi, M. 2014, MNRAS, 442, 900
- Nakajima, K., Ouchi, M., Shimasaku, K., et al. 2013, ApJ, 769, 3
- Neufeld, D. A. 1990, ApJ, 350, 216
- Orlitová, I., Verhamme, A., Henry, A., et al. 2018, A&A, 616, A60
- Osterbrock, D. E. 1989, Astrophysics of gaseous nebulae and active galactic nuclei (ApJ)
- Ouchi, M., Ono, Y., Egami, E., et al. 2009, ApJ, 696, 1164
- Palmerio, J. T., Vergani, S. D., Salvaterra, R., et al. 2019, A&A, 623, A26
- Pei, Y. C. 1992, ApJ, 395, 130
- Pentericci, L., Grazian, A., Fontana, A., et al. 2007, A&A, 471, 433
- Pentericci, L., Grazian, A., Scarlata, C., et al. 2010, A&A, 514, A64
- Perley, D. A., Cenko, S. B., Bloom, J. S., et al. 2009, AJ, 138, 1690
- Perley, D. A., Krühler, T., Schulze, S., et al. 2016a, ApJ, 817, 7
- Perley, D. A., Levan, A. J., Tanvir, N. R., et al. 2013, ApJ, 778, 128
- Perley, D. A., Tanvir, N. R., Hjorth, J., et al. 2016b, ApJ, 817, 8
- Planck Collaboration, Ade, P. A. R., Aghanim, N., et al. 2016, A&A, 594, A13
- Prochaska, J. X., Chen, H.-W., Dessauges-Zavadsky, M., & Bloom, J. S. 2007, ApJ, 666, 267
- Reddy, N. A., Steidel, C. C., Pettini, M., et al. 2008, ApJS, 175, 48
- Rivera-Thorsen, T. E., Dahle, H., Gronke, M., et al. 2017, A&A, 608, L4
- Rivera-Thorsen, T. E., Hayes, M., Östlin, G., et al. 2015, ApJ, 805, 14
- Safarzadeh, M. & Scannapieco, E. 2016, ApJ, 832, L9
- Salvaterra, R., Ferrara, A., & Dayal, P. 2011, MNRAS, 414, 847
- Salvaterra, R., Maio, U., Ciardi, B., & Campisi, M. A. 2013, MNRAS, 429, 2718
- Salvaterra, R., Valle, M. D., Campana, S., et al. 2009, Nature, 461, 1258
- Savaglio, S. 2006, New Journal of Physics, 8, 195
- Schaerer, D., Hayes, M., Verhamme, A., & Teyssier, R. 2011, A&A, 531, A12
- Schaerer, D. & Verhamme, A. 2008, A&A, 480, 369
- Schlafly, E. F. & Finkbeiner, D. P. 2011, ApJ, 737, 103
- Schulze, S., Chapman, R., Hjorth, J., et al. 2015, ApJ, 808, 73
- Selsing, J., Malesani, D., Goldoni, P., et al. 2019, A&A, 623, A92
- Shapley, A. E., Steidel, C. C., Pettini, M., & Adelberger, K. L. 2003, ApJ, 588, 65
- Sobral, D., Matthee, J., Darvish, B., et al. 2015, ApJ, 808, 139
- Starling, R. L. C., Wijers, R. a. M. J., Hughes, M. A., et al. 2005, MNRAS, 360, 305
- Stasińska, G., Izotov, Y., Morisset, C., & Guseva, N. 2015, A&A, 576, A83
- Steidel, C. C., Adelberger, K. L., Shapley, A. E., et al. 2003, ApJ, 592, 728
- Steidel, C. C., Bogosavljević, M., Shapley, A. E., et al. 2011, The Astrophysical Journal, 736, 160
- Steidel, C. C., Shapley, A. E., Pettini, M., et al. 2004, ApJ, 604, 534
- Tanvir, N. R., Fox, D. B., Levan, A. J., et al. 2009, Nature, 461, 1254
- Tanvir, N. R., Fynbo, J. P. U., de Ugarte Postigo, A., et al. 2019, MNRAS, 483, 5380
- Thöne, C. C., Campana, S., Lazzati, D., et al. 2011, MNRAS, 414, 479
- Totani, T., Kawai, N., Kosugi, G., et al. 2006, PASJ, 58, 485
- Troja, E., Cusumano, G., O'Brien, P. T., et al. 2007, ApJ, 665, 599
- van Dokkum, P. G. 2001, PASP, 113, 1420
- Vanzella, E., Caminha, G. B., Calura, F., et al. 2020, MNRAS, 491, 1093
- Vanzella, E., de Barros, S., Vasei, K., et al. 2016, ApJ, 825, 41
- Vergani, S., Piranomonte, S., Petitjean, P., et al. 2011, Astron. Nachr., 332, 292
- Vergani, S. D., Palmerio, J., Salvaterra, R., et al. 2017, A&A, 599, A120
- Verhamme, A., Orlitová, I., Schaerer, D., & Hayes, M. 2015, A&A, 578, A7
- Verhamme, A., Orlitová, I., Schaerer, D., et al. 2017, A&A, 597, A13
- Verhamme, A., Schaerer, D., Atek, H., & Tapken, C. 2008, A&A, 491, 89
- Verhamme, A., Schaerer, D., & Maselli, A. 2006, A&A, 460, 397
- Vernet, J., Dekker, H., D'Odorico, S., et al. 2011, A&A, 536, A105
- Vernet, J., Kerber, F., Mainieri, V., et al. 2009, Proc. IAU, 5, 535
- Vielfaure, J. B., Vergani, S. D., Japelj, J., et al. 2020, A&A, 641, A30
- Vreeswijk, P. M., Ellison, S. L., Ledoux, C., et al. 2004, A&A, 419, 927
- Vreeswijk, P. M., Ledoux, C., Raassen, A. J. J., et al. 2013, A&A, 549, A22
- Vreeswijk, P. M., Smette, A., Fruchter, A. S., et al. 2006, A&A, 447, 145
- White, N. E. 2020, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2003.01592
- Wiseman, P., Perley, D. A., Schady, P., et al. 2017, A&A, 607, A107
- Wisotzki, L., Bacon, R., Blaizot, J., et al. 2016, A&A, 587, A98
- Wofford, A., Leitherer, C., & Salzer, J. 2013, ApJ, 765, 118
- Yang, H., Malhotra, S., Gronke, M., et al. 2016, ApJ, 820, 130
- Yang, H., Malhotra, S., Gronke, M., et al. 2017, ApJ, 844, 171
- Zitrin, A., Labbé, I., Belli, S., et al. 2015, ApJ, 810, L12

Appendix A: Tables of the properties of the objects in the samples

The following tables present the LGRB host galaxies and afterglows from the TOUGH and XHG samples, the literature, and this work, for which the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ emission line has been detected or an upper limit has been estimated. *GRB* and *Redshift* are for the name of the LGRB and its redshift. When observations of the host galaxy or the optical afterglow are available, we provide the name of the spectrographs used in the columns *Hosts* and *OA*, respectively. "no" indicates that no observation is available. "F1"/"F2" is for VLT/FORS1/2 and "xsh" for VLT/X-shooter spectrograph. *Ly α Host* and *Ly α OA* inform about the detection of the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ line in the host or afterglow spectra, respectively. No information is provided when no spectra are available to verify the presence of the line. *F(Ly α)* and *L(Ly α)* correspond to the $\text{Ly}\alpha$ line flux and luminosity (respectively) retrieved from the literature (see references in column *Refs*) or derived in this work. *EW(Ly α)* corresponds to the rest-frame $\text{Ly}\alpha$ equivalent width. $N_{\text{H I}}$ is for the neutral hydrogen column density determined from the GRB afterglow. M_{UV} is the UV magnitude of the LGRB host galaxy. M_* is its stellar mass. R is for the apparent magnitude of the host in the R band. *SFR* is the star-formation rate. $\log(sSFR/\text{yr}^{-1})$ is the specific star-formation rate. $E(B-V)$ is the host extinction. $12 + \log(O/H)$ is the oxygen abundance. Z is the metallicity determined from the absorption lines detected in the GRB afterglow spectrum.

References: (1): Milvang-Jensen et al. (2012); (2): This work; (3): Schulze et al. (2015); (4): Perley et al. (2016b); (5): Tanvir et al. (2019); (6): Krühler et al. (2015); (7): Palmerio et al. (2019); (8): Selsing et al. (2019); (9): Vielfaure et al. (2020); (10): Jakobsson et al. (2003); (11): Fynbo et al. (2005); (12): Vreeswijk et al. (2004); (13): Jakobsson et al. (2004); (14): D'Avanzo et al. (2010); (15): Perley et al. (2013); (16): de Ugarte Postigo et al. (2005); (17): Kruehler & Schady (2017); (18): Jakobsson et al. (2006); (19): Bolmer et al. (2019); (20): Heintz et al. (2019); (21): Cucchiara et al. (2015); (22): Savaglio (2006); (23): Vreeswijk et al. (2006); (24): Prochaska et al. (2007); (25): Thöne et al. (2011); (26): Elíasdóttir et al. (2009); (27): Chen et al. (2007).

Table A.1. List of the LGRBs in the TOUGH sample with Ly α -emission detection (in bold) or upper limit.

GRB	Redshift	Host	OA	Ly α Host	Ly α OA	EW(Ly α) [Å]	F(Ly α) [10 ⁻¹⁷ erg s ⁻¹ cm ⁻²]	L(Ly α) [10 ⁴² erg s ⁻¹]	Refs
050315	1.9500	F1	no	yes	...	9.2 ± 2.8	2.34 ± 0.68	0.64 ± 0.19	(1)
050401	2.8983	F1	F2	no	no	< 16.3	< 1.12	< 0.80	(1)
050714B	2.4383	xsh	F1	no	no	< 17.08	< 0.74	< 0.36	(2)
050730	3.9686	F1	UVES	no	no	...	< 0.87	< 1.32	(1)
050819	2.5042	xsh	no	no	...	< 9.30	< 1.74	< 0.91	(2)
050820A	2.6147	F1	UVES	no	no	< 8.1	< 1.01	< 0.56	(1)
050908	3.3467	F1	F1	no	no	...	< 0.64	< 0.64	(1)
050915A	2.5273	xsh	F1	no	no	< 9.45	< 0.61	< 0.33	(2)
050922C	2.1992	F1	AlFOSC	no	no	...	< 1.93	< 0.70	(1)
051001	2.4296	xsh	F1	no	no	< 7.21	< 0.84	< 0.41	(2)
060115	3.5328	F1	F1	no	no	...	< 1.18	< 1.35	(1)
060526	3.2213	F1	F1	no	no	< 19.5	< 0.79	< 0.73	(1)
060604	2.1357	F1, xsh	AlFOSC	no	no	< 12.1	< 0.90	< 0.31	(1)
060605	3.7730	F1	PMAS	yes	no	33.7 ± 10.5	1.70 ± 0.27	2.28 ± 0.36	(1)
060607A	3.0749	F1	UVES	no	no	...	< 0.73	< 0.60	(1)
060707	3.4240	F1, xsh	F1	yes	no	11.2 ± 2.3	1.65 ± 0.31	1.75 ± 0.33	(1)
060714	2.7108	F1	F1	no	yes	... (< 26.3)	1.73 (< 8.1)	1.10 (< 0.49)	(1), (18)
060805A	2.3633	xsh	no	no	...	< 14.84	< 0.77	< 0.35	(2)
060814	1.9223	xsh	F1, F2	no	no	< 7.12	< 2.33	< 0.64	(2)
060908	1.8836	F1	F1, F2	yes	no	40.4 ± 6.7	7.78 ± 0.95	1.94 ± 0.24	(1)
061110B	3.4344	F1	F1	no	no	< 10.7	< 0.66	< 0.71	(1)
070103	2.6208	xsh	F2	no	no	< 19.40	< 1.42	< 0.83	(2)
070110	2.3523	F1, xsh	F1	yes	yes	31.8 ± 4.3	4.0 ± 0.4	1.73 ± 0.17	(1)
070129	2.3384	xsh	F1, F2	no	no	< 13.92	< 1.94	< 0.86	(2)
070224	1.9922	xsh	no	no	...	< 75.8	< 2.12	< 0.64	(2)
070328	2.0627	xsh	no	no	...	< 9.52	< 0.87	< 0.28	(2)
070419B	1.9586	xsh	F1	no	no	< 90.06	< 2.15	< 0.62	(2)
070506	2.3090	F1	F1	yes	no	32.3 ± 11.8	1.39 ± 0.35	0.57 ± 0.14	(1)
070611	2.0394	F1	F2	no	no	...	< 0.96	< 0.29	(1)
070721B	3.6298	F1	F2	yes	yes	32.5 ± 8.0	1.12 ± 0.16	1.37 ± 0.19	(1)
070802	2.4541	F1, xsh	F2	no	no	< 8.1	< 0.89	< 0.43	(1)

Notes. For GRB 060714 the values reported correspond to the Ly α detection from the afterglow spectrum (Jakobsson et al. 2006) but the upper limits derived from the host galaxy (Milvang-Jensen et al. 2012) are given between brackets.

Table A.2. Properties of the LGRBs in the TOUGH sample with Ly α -emission detection (in bold) or upper limit.

GRB	N_{H} [$\log(N_{\text{H}}/\text{cm}^{-2})$]	M_{UV} [mag]	M_* [$\log(M_*/M_{\odot})$]	R [mag]	Refs	SFR [$M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$]	$\log(\text{sSFR}/\text{yr}^{-1})$	E(B-V)	$12 + \log(\text{O}/\text{H})$	Z	Refs
050315	...	-20.08 ± 0.14	9.7	24.51 ± 0.15	(3),(4)	(24)
050401	22.60 ± 0.30	-19.28 ± 0.31	9.61	26.19 ± 0.31	(5),(3)	-1.05 ± 0.18	(6)
050714B	...	-19.61 ± 0.19	...	25.51 ± 0.20	(3)	$12.9^{+14.0}_{-5.3}$...	$0.21^{+0.28}_{-0.21}$	(21)
050730	22.10 ± 0.10	> -17.21	< 9.46	> 27.2	(5),(1)	-1.96 ± 0.11	(6)
050819	...	-21.13 ± 0.09	...	23.99 ± 0.09	(3)	22^{+426}_{-15}	...	$0.34^{+0.84}_{-0.34}$	(6),(21)
050820A	21.10 ± 0.10	-18.93 ± 0.06	8.95	24.8	(5),(1),(17)	0.9	-9.00	-0.76 ± 0.13	(6)
050908	17.60 ± 0.10	-18.18 ± 0.27	< 9.91	27.7	(5),(1)	(6)
050915A	...	-20.47 ± 0.15	10.66	24.70 ± 0.16	(3),(17)	1.9	-10.39	$0.84^{+0.61}_{-0.60}$	(21)
051001	...	> -17.95	< 9.01	> 26.29	(5),(1)	-1.88 ± 0.14	(6)
060115	21.50 ± 0.10	-20.55 ± 0.12	10.08	24.53 ± 0.13	(3),(4)	110^{+124}_{-59}	$-8.04^{+0.33}_{-0.33}$	$0.58^{+0.28}_{-0.28}$	(21)
060526	20.00 ± 0.15	-18.61 ± 0.27	9.43	27.1	(5),(1)	> -1.53	(25)
060604	...	> -17.36	9.30	> 27.0	(5),(1)	-1.09 ± 0.24	(6)
060605	18.90 ± 0.40	-19.23 ± 0.17	...	25.62 ± 0.18	(3)	$7.2^{+9.4}_{-3.6}$...	$0.38^{+0.32}_{-0.27}$	$8.10^{+0.28}_{-0.35}$...	(6)
060607A	16.95 ± 0.03	-17.94 ± 0.20	< 9.97	> 26.5	(5),(1)	(6)
060707	21.00 ± 0.20	> -15.52	< 9.45	> 28.05	(5),(3)	(6),(21)
060714	21.80 ± 0.10	-20.78 ± 0.06	9.99	25.01 ± 0.06	(5),(3)	$19.9^{+48.0}_{-14.3}$	$-8.69^{+0.53}_{-0.56}$	≥ -1.69	(21)
060805A	...	-18.88 ± 0.28	9.25	26.46 ± 0.28	(5),(3)	≥ -0.97	(6)
060814	...	-19.79 ± 0.13	...	25.26 ± 0.14	(3)	$9.0^{+3.9}_{-2.5}$...	$0.00^{+0.16}_{-0.09}$	(7),(6)
060908	...	-21.46 ± 0.10	10.00	22.96 ± 0.11	(3),(17)	$47.5^{+72.5}_{-15.6}$	$-8.32^{+0.40}_{-0.17}$	$0.17^{+0.39}_{-0.17}$	$8.46^{+0.10}_{-0.16}$...	(21)
061110B	22.35 ± 0.10	-18.93 ± 0.17	9.15	25.66 ± 0.18	(3),(4)	≥ -1.84	(6)
070103	...	-19.82 ± 0.29	< 9.47	26.0	(5),(1)	(21)
070110	21.70 ± 0.10	-21.03 ± 0.14	...	24.21 ± 0.14	(3)	$43^{+162}_{-10.9}$...	$0.00^{+0.50}_{-0.08}$	(6)
070129	...	-19.81 ± 0.11	< 9.16	25.19 ± 0.11	(5),(3)	$8.9^{+10.9}_{-2.8}$	< -7.86	$0.00^{+0.38}_{-0.00}$...	≥ -1.32	(6),(21)
070224	...	-20.75 ± 0.11	10.15	24.23 ± 0.12	(3),(4)	20^{+28}_{-7}	$-8.85^{+0.38}_{-0.19}$	$0.17^{+0.35}_{-0.17}$	(6)
070328	...	-18.71 ± 0.29	...	26.02 ± 0.31	(3)	$3.2^{+6.5}_{-3}$	(6)
070419B	...	-20.17 ± 0.12	9.65	24.55 ± 0.13	(3),(17)	$8.4^{+130.0}_{-4.5}$	$-8.76^{+1.25}_{-0.43}$	$0.16^{+0.39}_{-0.48}$	(6)
070506	22.00 ± 0.30	-19.44 ± 0.19	9.84	25.20 ± 0.20	(3),(4)	21^{+35}_{-11}	$-8.52^{+0.32}_{-0.32}$	$0.56^{+0.30}_{-0.30}$...	≥ -0.65	(21)
070611	21.30 ± 0.20	-18.80 ± 0.21	...	26.21 ± 0.22	(5),(3)	(21)
070721B	21.50 ± 0.20	> -17.52	...	> 27.27	(5),(3)	(21)
070802	21.50 ± 0.20	-18.39 ± 0.44	< 9.42	27.5	(5),(1)	≥ -2.14	(21)
		-19.85 ± 0.20	9.69	25.25 ± 0.21	(5),(3)	24^{+11}_{-8}	$-8.31^{+0.16}_{-0.17}$	$0.31^{+0.12}_{-0.12}$...	-0.46 ± 0.38	(6),(26)

Table A.3. List of the LGRBs in the XHG sample with Ly α -emission detection (in bold) or upper limit determined in this work.

GRB	Redshift	Host	OA	Ly α Host	Ly α OA	EW(Ly α) [Å]	F(Ly α) [10 ⁻¹⁷ erg s ⁻¹ cm ⁻²]	L(Ly α) [10 ⁴² erg s ⁻¹]
050714B	2.4383	xsh, F1	no	no	...	< 17.1	< 0.74	< 0.36
050819	2.5042	xsh	no	no	...	< 9.3	< 1.74	< 0.91
050915A	2.5275	xsh	F1	no	no	< 9.5	< 0.61	< 0.33
051001	2.4295	xsh, F1	no	no	...	< 7.2	< 0.84	< 0.41
060204B	2.3393	xsh	no	no	...	< 36.2	< 8.73	< 3.88
060604	2.1355	xsh, F1	AIPOSC	no	no	< 11.7	< 0.87	< 0.31
060707	3.4240	xsh, F1	F1	no	no	...	< 0.65	< 0.73
060805A	2.3633	xsh	no	no	...	< 14.8	< 0.78	< 0.35
060814	1.9223	xsh	F1, F2	no	no	< 7.1	< 2.33	< 0.64
060926	3.2090	xsh	F1	yes	yes	37.0 ± 7.0	5.30 ± 0.40	5.05 ± 0.38
061202	2.2543	xsh	no	no	...	< 16.7	< 1.76	< 0.71
070103	2.6208	xsh, F2	no	no	...	< 19.4	< 1.42	< 0.83
070110	2.3523	xsh	F2	yes	yes	33.0 ± 8.0	2.80 ± 0.50	1.26 ± 0.23
070129	2.3384	xsh	F1, F2	no	no	< 13.9	< 1.94	< 0.86
070224	1.9922	xsh	no	no	< 2.12	< 0.64
070328	2.0627	xsh	no	no	...	< 9.5	< 0.87	< 0.28
070419B	1.9586	xsh	F1	no	no	...	< 2.15	< 0.62
070521	2.0865	xsh	no	no	< 1.54	< 0.52
070802	2.4538	xsh, F1	F2	no	no	< 9.7	< 0.71	< 0.36
071021	2.4515	xsh	no	no	< 1.41	< 0.70
080207	2.0856	xsh	no	no	...	< 16.1	< 1.06	< 0.36
080602	1.8204	xsh	no	no	...	< 10.3	< 3.98	< 0.96
080605	1.6410	xsh	F2	no	no	< 18.2	< 15.29	< 2.86
080804	2.2059	xsh	UVES	no	no	< 17.5	< 0.82	< 0.32
081210	2.0631	xsh	no	no	...	< 22.1	< 1.84	< 0.60
081221	2.2590	xsh	no	no	...	< 27.3	< 0.56	< 0.23
090113	1.7494	xsh	no	no	< 4.13	< 0.90
090201	2.1000	xsh	no	no	< 2.78	< 0.95
090323	3.5832	xsh	F2	no	no	< 19.0	< 4.24	< 5.26
100424A	2.4656	xsh	no	yes	3.40 ± 0.50	1.72 ± 0.22
110818A	3.3609	xsh	xsh	no	no	...	< 0.47	< 0.50
111123A	3.1513	xsh	xsh	no	no	< 6.8	< 1.15	< 1.05
120118B	2.9428	xsh	no	no	...	< 4.6	< 2.37	< 1.84
120119A	1.7291	xsh	xsh	no	no	...	< 10.95	< 2.33
120624B	2.1974	xsh	no	no	< 0.64	< 0.25
120815A	2.3587	xsh	xsh	no	no	< 15.2	< 1.89	< 0.86
130131B	2.5393	xsh	no	no	...	< 6.2	< 1.49	< 0.81

Table A.4. Properties of the LGRBs in the XHG sample with Ly α -emission detection (in bold) or upper limit.

GRB	N_{H} [$\log(N_{\text{H}}/\text{cm}^{-2})$]	M_{UV} [mag]	M_* [$\log(M_*/M_{\odot})$]	R [mag]	Refs	SFR [$M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$]	$\log(\text{sSFR}/\text{yr}^{-1})$	E(B-V)	12 + $\log(\text{O}/\text{H})$	Z	Refs
050714B	...	-19.61 \pm 0.19	...	25.51 \pm 0.20	(3)	12.9 ^{+14.0} _{-5.3}	...	0.21 ^{+0.28} _{-0.21}	(6)
050819	...	-21.13 \pm 0.09	...	23.99 \pm 0.09	(3)	22 ⁺⁴²⁶ ₋₁₅	...	0.34 ^{+0.64} _{-0.61}	(6)
050915A	...	-20.47 \pm 0.15	10.66	24.70 \pm 0.16	(3),(17)	1.9	-10.39	0.84 ^{+0.60} _{-0.58}	(6)
051001	...	-20.55 \pm 0.12	10.08	24.53 \pm 0.13	(3),(4)	110 ⁺¹²⁴ ₋₅₉	-8.04 ^{+0.33} _{-0.33}	0.58 ^{+0.38} _{-0.38}	(6)
060204B	9.81	...	(17)	78 ⁺⁸⁵ ₋₃₄	-7.92 ^{+0.32} _{-0.25}	0.34 ^{+0.29} _{-0.33}	(6)
060604	25.62 \pm 0.18	(3)	7.2 ^{+3.4} _{-0.4}	...	0.38 ^{+0.52} _{-0.27}	8.10 ^{+0.28} _{-0.35}	...	(6)
060707	21.00 \pm 0.20	-20.78 \pm 0.06	9.99	25.01 \pm 0.06	(5),(3)	19.9 ^{+48.0} _{-14.3}	-8.69 ^{+0.53} _{-0.56}	≥ -1.69	(6),(21)
060805A	...	-19.79 \pm 0.13	...	25.26 \pm 0.14	(3)	9.0 ^{+2.5} _{-3.9}	...	0.00 ^{+0.16} _{-0.09}	(6)
060814	...	-21.46 \pm 0.10	10.03 \pm 0.10	22.96 \pm 0.11	(3),(4)	47.5 ^{+72.5} _{-15.6}	-8.35 ^{+0.40} _{-0.41}	0.17 ^{+0.39} _{-0.17}	8.46 ^{+0.10} _{-0.16}	...	(6),(7)
060926	22.60 \pm 0.15	-21.59 \pm 0.05	10.71	...	(5)	26 ⁺¹⁷ ₋₇	-8.01 ^{+0.45} _{-0.31}	≥ -1.32	(6),(21)
061202	9.64	...	(17)	43 ⁺⁶⁰ ₋₂₂	...	0.58 ^{+0.34} _{-0.27}	(6)
070103	...	-21.03 \pm 0.14	...	24.21 \pm 0.14	(3)	43 ⁺¹⁶² _{-17.9}	...	0.00 ^{+0.50} _{-0.09}	(6)
070110	21.70 \pm 0.10	-19.81 \pm 0.11	< 9.16	25.19 \pm 0.11	(5)	8.9 ^{+16.9} _{-2.8}	> -8.37	0.00 ^{+0.38} _{-0.09}	...	≥ -1.32	(6),(21)
070129	...	-20.75 \pm 0.11	10.15	24.23 \pm 0.12	(3),(4)	20 ⁺⁷ ₋₇	-8.85 ^{+0.38} _{-0.19}	0.17 ^{+0.32} _{-0.17}	(6)
070224	...	-18.71 \pm 0.29	...	26.02 \pm 0.31	(3)	3.2 ^{+6.5} _{-2.3}	(6)
070328	...	-20.17 \pm 0.12	9.65	24.55 \pm 0.13	(3),(17)	8.4 ^{+130.7} _{-4.3}	-8.73 ^{+1.23} _{-0.39}	0.16 ^{+0.39} _{-0.46}	(6)
070419B	...	-19.44 \pm 0.19	9.84	25.20 \pm 0.20	(3),(4)	21 ⁺³⁵ ₋₁₁	-8.52 ^{+0.42} _{-0.39}	0.56 ^{+0.39} _{-0.08}	(6)
070521	10.5	...	(17)	26 ⁺¹⁷ ₋₇	-9.09 ^{+0.47} _{-0.39}	0.71 ^{+0.65} _{-0.05}	(6)
070802	21.50 \pm 0.20	-19.85 \pm 0.20	9.69	25.25 \pm 0.21	(5),(3)	32 ⁺²⁰ ₋₈	-8.31 ^{+0.16} _{-0.17}	0.31 ^{+0.12} _{-0.12}	...	-0.46 ± 0.63	(6),(20)
071021	10.10	...	(17)	77 ⁺³⁸ ₋₁₂	-8.59 ^{+0.21} _{-0.29}	0.19 ^{+0.12} _{-0.12}	(6)
080207	11.09	25.84 \pm 0.18	(17)	...	-9.20 ^{+0.29} _{-0.29}	0.66 ^{+0.37} _{-0.38}	8.74 ^{+0.15} _{-0.15}	...	(6)
080602	9.40 \pm 0.10	...	(7)	> 48	> -7.72	0.58 ^{+0.26} _{-0.26}	8.69 ^{+0.15} _{-0.15}	...	(6),(7)
080605	9.60 \pm 0.10	...	(7)	42.5 ^{+30.5} _{-18.2}	-7.97 ^{+0.23} _{-0.24}	0.26 ^{+0.11} _{-0.10}	8.47 ^{+0.04} _{-0.04}	...	(6),(7)
080804	21.30 \pm 0.15	...	9.28	...	(5)	15.2 ^{+4.2} _{-1.7}	-8.10 ^{+0.37} _{-0.37}	0.38 ^{+0.51} _{-0.35}	...	-0.75 ± 0.16	(6),(21)
081210	10.07	...	(17)	15.3 ^{+11.7} _{-7.0}	-8.89 ^{+0.27} _{-0.33}	0.13 ^{+0.33} _{-0.13}	(6)
081221	10.08	...	(17)	35 ⁺¹⁰⁶ ₋₂₂	-8.54 ^{+0.61} _{-0.43}	0.31 ^{+0.35} _{-0.31}	(6)
090113	9.90	...	(17)	17.9 ^{+10.1} _{-4.8}	-8.65 ^{+0.16} _{-0.14}	0.01 ^{+0.22} _{-0.01}	(6)
090201	10.90	...	(4)	48 ⁺³⁰ ₋₁₃	-9.22 ^{+0.24} _{-0.35}	0.11 ^{+0.19} _{-0.11}	(6)
090323	20.75 \pm 0.10	-21.60 \pm 0.18	10.30	...	(5),(17)	24 ⁺¹⁷ ₋₁₃	-8.92 ^{+0.53} _{-0.53}	(6)
100424A	> 24	(8)	21 ⁺²⁰ ₋₈	...	0.13 ^{+0.18} _{-0.13}	7.93 ^{+0.25} _{-0.18}	...	(6)
110818A	21.90 \pm 0.40	-21.68 \pm 0.05	10.50	...	(5),(17)	44 ⁺⁶² ₋₂₆	-8.86 ^{+0.38} _{-0.39}	...	8.25 ^{+0.17} _{-0.28}	...	(6)
111123A	...	-22.05 \pm 0.03	11.17	...	(3),(17)	77 ⁺¹⁶³ ₋₃₁	-9.28 ^{+0.49} _{-0.49}	...	8.01 ^{+0.28} _{-0.28}	...	(6)
120118B	(5),(17)	28 ⁺¹¹ ₋₁₁	...	0.00 ^{+0.16} _{-0.09}	7.89 ^{+0.23} _{-0.17}	...	(6)
120119A	22.60 \pm 0.20	...	9.93	...	(5),(17)	43 ⁺²¹ ₋₁₄	-8.30 ^{+0.19} _{-0.17}	0.35 ^{+0.16} _{-0.14}	8.60 ^{+0.14} _{-0.14}	-0.96 ± 0.28	(6),(20)
120624B	10.84	...	(17)	30 ⁺⁷³ ₋₁₃	-9.36 ^{+0.53} _{-0.24}	0.21 ^{+0.50} _{-0.21}	8.43 ^{+0.20} _{-0.27}	...	(6)
120815A	22.05 \pm 0.10	(5)	2.3 ^{+2.7} _{-1.4}	...	0.06 ^{+0.34} _{-0.06}	...	-1.15 ± 0.12	(6),(20)
130131B	(5)	8.0 ^{+5.0} _{-5.0}	(6)

Table A.5. List of the LGRBs from the literature (other than TOUGH and XHG samples) and this work with Ly α -emission detection. GRBs 070223 and 080810 are not reported in this table despite the fact that they are reported in Appendix B.1 because no information on Ly α flux is available for these two GRB host galaxies.

GRB	Redshift	Host	OA	Ly α Host	Ly α OA	EW(Ly α) [Å]	F(Ly α) [10^{-17} erg s $^{-1}$ cm $^{-2}$]	L(Ly α) [10^{42} erg s $^{-1}$]	Refs
971214	3.4200	Keck	no	yes	...	13.0	0.62 ± 0.07	0.66 ± 0.07	(1)
000926	2.0400	AlFOSC	NOT	yes	no	71.0 ± 18.0	14.90 ± 1.10	4.51 ± 0.33	(1)
011211	2.1434	xsh	F1	yes	no	14.0 ± 3.0	1.60 ± 0.20	0.58 ± 0.07	(2)
021004	2.3298	xsh	UVES	yes	yes	105.0 ± 10.0	16.90 ± 0.30	7.45 ± 0.18	(2)
030323	3.3720	no	F2	...	yes	108.0 ± 38.0	1.20 ± 0.10	1.23 ± 0.10	(1)
030429	2.6600	no	F1	...	yes	...	0.31	0.19 ± 0.00	(1)
061222A	2.0880	LRIS	no	yes	...	31.0	16.80	5.39 ± 0.00	(1)
071031	2.6918	no	F2	...	yes	...	2.36 ± 0.27	1.41 ± 0.16	(1)
081121	2.5134	xsh	LDSS3	yes	no	...	4.90 ± 0.50	2.60 ± 0.26	(2)
081222	2.7700	xsh	GMOS-S	yes	no	...	1.60 ± 0.40	1.07 ± 0.27	(2)
090205	4.6500	no	F1	...	yes	...	2.36 ± 0.49	5.16 ± 1.08	(1)
121201A	3.3830	no	xsh	...	yes	...	2.14 ± 0.36	2.31 ± 0.39	(2)
150915A	1.9680	no	xsh	...	yes	...	5.00 ± 1.10	1.46 ± 0.32	(2)
151021A	2.3300	no	xsh	...	yes	...	10.50 ± 0.90	4.63 ± 0.40	(2)
170202A	3.6450	no	xsh	...	yes	...	2.70 ± 0.60	3.49 ± 0.78	(2)
191004B	3.5055	xsh	xsh	yes	yes	7.4 ± 2.6	1.00 ± 0.10	1.18 ± 0.18	(9)

Table A.6. Properties of the LGRBs from the literature (other than TOUGH and XHG samples) and this work with Ly α -emission detection.

GRB	N_{H} [$\log(N_{\text{H}} / \text{cm}^{-2})$]	M_{UV} [mag]	M_* [$\log(M_*/M_{\odot})$]	R [mag]	Refs	SFR [$M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$]	$\log(\text{sSFR}/\text{yr}^{-1})$	E(B-V)	12 + $\log(\text{O}/\text{H})$	Z	Refs
971214	$0.44^{+0.06}_{-0.03}$	(15)
000926	21.30 ± 0.25	$-20.40^{+0.07}_{-0.07}$	9.64	...	(5)	$0.19^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$...	-0.13 ± 0.21	(15),(22)
011211	20.40 ± 0.20	$-19.97^{+0.10}_{-0.10}$	8.0	24.95 ± 0.11	(5),(10)	< 2.0	< -7.70	$0.03^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$...	-0.90 ± 0.50	(2),(10),(23)
021004	19.50 ± 0.50	$-20.56^{+0.18}_{-0.18}$	9.45	24.39 ± 0.04	(5),(11)	6.7 ± 0.8	> -8.62	$0.02^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$...	-1.30 ± 0.50	(2),(16),(27)
030323	21.90 ± 0.07	$-18.47^{+0.10}_{-0.10}$	< 9.85	28.0 ± 0.3	(5),(12)	-1.26 ± 0.20	(12)
030429	21.60 ± 0.20	> 26.3	(5),(13)	≥ -1.13	(21)
061222A	9.55	...	(4)	$0.00^{+0.00}_{-0.00}$	(15)
071031	22.15 ± 0.05	(5)	-1.85 ± 0.12	(21)
081121	9.24	...	(4)	> 7.0	> -8.35	(2)
081222	20.80 ± 0.20	$-22.43^{+0.0}_{-0.0}$	9.61	...	(5)	(21)
090205	20.73 ± 0.05	$-21.26^{+0.13}_{-0.13}$	< 10.7	26.4 ± 0.3	(5),(14)	≥ -0.57	(21)
121201A	22.00 ± 0.20	$-20.84^{+0.21}_{-0.21}$	(5)	(2)
150915A	21.20 ± 0.30	(5)	13.0 ± 0.6	(19)
151021A	22.20 ± 0.20	(5)	-0.98 ± 0.07	(19)
170202A	21.55 ± 0.10	(5)	-1.28 ± 0.09	(19)
191004B	17.20 ± 0.15	$-19.10^{+0.0}_{-0.0}$...	> 26.6	(5),(9)	2.85 ± 1.85	...	$0.01^{+0.01}_{-0.01}$	(9)

Appendix B: Table summarizing the LAE-LGRB census.**Table B.1.** List of the 29 LGRBs with Ly α emission line detected in the host galaxy or optical afterglow spectra.

GRB	Redshift	Host	OA	Ly α Host	Ly α OA	Flux(Ly α)	Sample	Refs
971214	3.4200	Keck	no	yes	-	0.6 ± 0.1	-	(1), (2), (3), (8)
000926	2.0400	AlFOSC	NOT	yes	no	14.9 ± 1.1	-	(4), (8)
011211	2.1434	xsh	F1	yes	no	1.6 ± 0.2	-	(2)
021004	2.3298	xsh	UVES	yes	yes	16.9 ± 0.3	-	(2)
030323	3.3720	no	F2	-	yes	1.2 ± 0.1	-	(2), (6), (8)
030429	2.6600	no	F1	-	yes	$0.3 (2\sigma)$	-	(7)
050315	1.9500	F1	no	yes	-	2.3 ± 0.7	TOUGH	(8)
060605	3.7730	F1	PMAS	yes	no	1.7 ± 0.3	TOUGH	(8)
060707	3.4240	F1, xsh	F1	yes	no	1.7 ± 0.3	TOUGH, XHG ^a	(8), (10)
060714	2.7108	F1	F1	no	yes	1.7	TOUGH ^b	(8), (10), (11)
060908	1.8836	F1	F1, F2	yes	no	7.8 ± 1.0	TOUGH	(8)
060926	3.2090	xsh	F1	yes	yes	5.3 ± 0.4	XHG	(8), (10)
061222A	2.0880	LRIS	no	yes	-	16.8	-	(8), (12)
070110	2.3523	F1, xsh	F1	yes	yes	4.0 ± 0.4	TOUGH, XHG	(8), (10)
070223	1.6295	LRIS	no	yes	-	-	-	(9)
070506	2.3090	F1	F1	yes	no	1.4 ± 0.4	TOUGH	(8), (10)
070721B	3.6298	F1	F2	yes	yes	1.1 ± 0.2	TOUGH	(8), (10)
071031	2.6918	no	F2	-	yes	2.4 ± 0.3	-	(8), (10)
080810	3.3604	LRIS	AlFOSC	yes	yes	-	-	(10), (23)
081121	2.5134	xsh	LDSS3	yes	no	4.9 ± 0.5	-	(20), (21)
081222	2.7700	xsh	GMOS-S	yes	no	1.6 ± 0.4	-	(17), (20)
090205	4.6500	no	F1	-	yes	2.4 ± 0.5	-	(8), (13)
100316A	3.1600	no	OSIRIS	no	yes	-	-	(17)
100424A	2.4656	xsh	no	yes	-	3.4 ± 0.5	XHG	(15), (18)
121201A	3.3830	no	xsh	-	yes	2.1 ± 0.4	XAFT	(16), (19)
150915A	1.9680	no	xsh	-	yes	5.0 ± 1.1	XAFT	(16)
151021A	2.3300	no	xsh	-	yes	10.5 ± 0.9	XAFT	(16)
170202A	3.6450	no	xsh	-	yes	2.7 ± 0.6	XAFT	(16)
191004B	3.5055	xsh	xsh	yes	yes	1.0 ± 0.1	-	(20), (22)

Notes. *GRB* and *Redshift* are for the name of the LGRB and its redshift. When observations of the host galaxy or the optical afterglow are available, we provide the name of the spectrographs used in the columns *Hosts* and *OA*, respectively. "no" indicates that no observation is available. "F1"/"F2" is for VLT/FORS1/2 and "xsh" for VLT/X-shooter spectrograph. *Ly α Host* and *Ly α OA* inform about the detection of the Ly α line in the host or afterglow spectra, respectively. No information is provided when no spectra are available to verify the presence of the line. *Flux(Ly α)* corresponds to the Ly α line flux, in units of $10^{-17} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ \AA}^{-1}$, retrieved from the literature (see references in column *Refs*) or derived in this work. *Samples* indicates to which sample the LGRB belongs. *Refs* is for the references where the Ly α detection is reported.


^a GRB 060707 is part of the XHG sample but the Ly α is not detected in the X-shooter spectrum.

^b For GRB 060714 the Ly α line is only detected at 2.5σ in the host galaxy observation of Milvang-Jensen et al. (2012) but is convincingly detected in the afterglow spectrum presented by Jakobsson et al. (2006), therefore we consider it as a detection and report the flux measured in the afterglow spectrum corrected for Galactic extinction.

References: (1): Kulkarni et al. (1998); (2): Fynbo et al. (2003); (3): Ahn (2000); (4): Fynbo et al. (2002); (5): Jakobsson et al. (2005); (6): Vreeswijk et al. (2004); (7): Jakobsson et al. (2004); (8): Milvang-Jensen et al. (2012); (9): Perley et al. (2016a); (10): Fynbo et al. (2009); (11): Jakobsson et al. (2006); (12): Perley et al. (2009); (13): D'Avanzo et al. (2010); (14): Hartoog et al. (2015); (15): Krühler et al. (2015); (16): Selsing et al. (2019); (17): Tanvir et al. (2019); (18): Malesani et al. (2013); (19): Cucchiara et al. (2015); (20): this work, (21): Berger & Rauch (2008), (22): D'Elia et al. (2019), (23): Wiseman et al. (2017)

Appendix C: Results of the shell model with constraints from the GRB host galaxy.**Table C.1.** Shell-model predictions with constraints on: z^{HG} , $\text{FWHM}_i^{\text{HG}}(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ and $\text{EW}_i^{\text{HG}}(\text{Ly}\alpha)$

GRB host	Δz	$\log(N_{\text{HII}}\text{cm}^{-2})$	V_{exp} [km s ⁻¹]	$\log(T/\text{K})$	τ_d	$\text{FWHM}_i(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ [km s ⁻¹]	$\text{EW}_i(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ [Å]
GRB 011211	30^{+45}_{-45}	$19.9^{+0.2}_{-0.2}$	90^{+21}_{-26}	$4.17^{+0.9}_{-0.9}$	$0.47^{+0.39}_{-0.27}$	50^{+10}_{-10}	33^{+20}_{-16}
GRB 021004	5^{+45}_{-45}	$19.6^{+0.1}_{-0.1}$	120^{+5}_{-6}	$4.96^{+0.17}_{-0.14}$	$0.399^{+0.114}_{-0.084}$	223^{+13}_{-12}	165^{+14}_{-13}
GRB 060926	7^{+45}_{-45}	$19.8^{+0.1}_{-0.1}$	158^{+5}_{-5}	$4.97^{+0.17}_{-0.17}$	$1.27^{+0.28}_{-0.23}$	148^{+7}_{-7}	107^{+3}_{-2}
GRB 070110	3^{+45}_{-45}	$19.8^{+0.1}_{-0.1}$	92^{+13}_{-11}	$3.69^{+0.90}_{-0.55}$	$0.083^{+0.138}_{-0.062}$	20^{+26}_{-12}	20^{+10}_{-6}

Notes. Same as Table 5.**Fig. C.1.** Same as Fig. 9 but with the shell model parameters z^{HG} , $\text{FWHM}_i^{\text{HG}}(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ and $\text{EW}_i^{\text{HG}}(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ constrained by the values determined from the observations of the GRB host galaxy.

Appendix D: Results of the shell model with constraints from the GRB afterglow.

Table D.1. Shell-model predictions with constraints on: z^{HG} , $N_{\text{HI}}^{\text{OA}}$, $V_{\text{LIS}}^{\text{OA}}$ and τ_d^{OA}

GRB host	Δz	$\log(N_{\text{HI}}\text{cm}^{-2})$	V_{exp} [km s $^{-1}$]	$\log(T/\text{K})$	τ_d	$\text{FWHM}_i(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ [km s $^{-1}$]	$\text{EW}_i(\text{Ly}\alpha)$ [Å]
GRB 011211	17^{+45}_{-45}	$20.2^{+0.1}_{-0.1}$	56^{+47}_{-28}	$3.52^{+0.87}_{-0.52}$	$0.65^{+0.51}_{-0.40}$	280^{+140}_{-165}	66^{+60}_{-34}
GRB 021004	6^{+45}_{-45}	$19.6^{+0.1}_{-0.1}$	117^{+5}_{-4}	$4.97^{+0.17}_{-0.15}$	$0.362^{+0.103}_{-0.075}$	269^{+15}_{-20}	162^{+16}_{-15}
GRB 060926	60^{+45}_{-45}	$21.5^{+0.1}_{-0.1}$	3^{+1}_{-1}	$3.04^{+0.12}_{-0.12}$	$0.003^{+0.004}_{-0.002}$	114^{+67}_{-44}	22^{+8}_{-5}
GRB 070110	43^{+45}_{-45}	$21.3^{+0.1}_{-0.1}$	3^{+1}_{-1}	$3.07^{+0.12}_{-0.17}$	$0.018^{+0.010}_{-0.007}$	10^{+9}_{-4}	62^{+17}_{-17}

Notes. Same as Table 5.




Fig. D.1. Same as Fig. 9 but with the shell model parameters z^{HG} , $N_{\text{HI}}^{\text{OA}}$, $V_{\text{LIS}}^{\text{OA}}$ and τ_d^{OA} constrained by the values determined from the observations of the GRB afterglow (and systemic redshift from the observations of the host galaxy).